# 1NC Polcap Shell

CIR will pass now. Bipartisan and presidential support.

**Free Enterprise 4-26** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Sens. Lindsay **Graham** (R-SC) **and** John **McCain** (R-AZ), the two lead negotiators in the Senate’s Gang of Eight immigration reform group, said that they **believe their** immigration reform **bill will** not just **have** a filibuster proof majority in the Senate—but majority **support from both parties and the president. “We have met with the president and he supports strongly our efforts.** He doesn’t agree with every part of the bill, but he recognizes that it is a careful compromise with concessions on all sides,” McCain said. Both senators spoke at the U.S. Chamber’s Reforming Immigration for a Better America event on April 26. (watch the webcast).

McCain acknowledged that there would be changes to the Senate bill, “This is the end of the beginning, not the beginning of the end.” The most contentious provisions, Graham said, will be around low and high-skilled visa programs and access to legal labor. “There will be efforts from the left and the right,” to change the caps on those workers.

The new W Visa for low-skilled workers would start at 20,000 and eventually reach 200,000. The Senate bill also raises the national cap on employment visas for high-skilled foreigners from 65,000 per year to 110,000 per year, with the ability to rise to 180,000 per year under certain economic circumstances.

Nevertheless, **both senators expressed confidence that the bill would pass the Senate with 70 votes, building momentum for House passage.**

Rep. Ted Poe, vice chairman of the House immigration subcommittee and chair of the House Immigration Reform Caucus, said he had misgivings about the Senate approach to dealing with a massive immigration bill and thinks a better way is to have several smaller measures addressing different aspects. He expects the House to deal with as many as 5 to 8 separate, smaller immigration bills, starting with the definition of what constitutes “operational control” of a secure border. “We must methodically look at each of the various components that need to be fixed before we move on,” Poe said.

Business leaders attending the Chamber event, including Mark Peters of Caterpillar Inc., Robin Paulino of Microsoft, and Ken Kimbro of Tyson Foods Inc., voiced support for the Senate proposal. “There is a strong, collective voice from the business community on this issue,” said Peter Schiron, assistant general counsel at Deloitte LLP.

“There is no doubt that there will be additional input and analysis through Senate hearings and amendments. That’s how it should be. We support a transparent and open process and debate,” Chamber President and CEO Tom Donohue told the packed room. “**Given the broad support** this bill has garnered **from business** and labor … from conservatives and liberals … and from **faith-based and civil groups,** I’m optimistic that **this time we have an excellent chance** at getting immigration reform done.”

Polcap’s key to overcome new anti-terror concerns from the Boston Bombing.

**Thomasson 4-27** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The turn-back-the-clock caucus wants to make sure no more** mad **bombers can cross our borders**, like the two who blew up the Boston Marathon, killing three and maiming many. The only problem with that, of course, is that both the suspects — the one who was killed in a shootout, and his younger brother, who was badly wounded and found hiding in a boat in a driveway — were here legally and really didn’t cross any borders. The older brother was even interviewed by the FBI and nominated by the CIA for a government terror watch list, and nothing untoward was found.

Those who really don’t want much except a Chinese-like wall built along our southern border to keep out the perceived riff raff are saying we should reassess an arduously negotiated compromise immigration bill in light of the Boston massacre. They would find some other reason to trash the proposal if the bombing had never taken place. Besides, once you’ve forced all the undocumented to leave, who would be left to build the wall? That’s an old question that is more and more valid.

**Egging on the** self-styled **libertarians** and contrarians in Congress **are the professional dissenters** — those ubiquitous nay saying blabber mouths on radio who incite to riot nearly any chance they get. I mean, there is good money in that nihilist shtick, what with all the paranoids running around waving semi- automatic assault weapons — or hiding under their beds when they aren’t running to the phone to shout, “Kudos to that.”

I’m sorry, but when I first began observing those charged with carrying out the public’s business nearly 60 years of journalism ago, there was some sanity in the conducting of it. Sure, there were crazies then, too, but most people ultimately recognized their diatribes as utterly counterproductive in the end. There were spirited differences in the legislature, but as dusk fell the parties involved were willing to take a chance on putting them aside for the good of all.

But I don’t just want to pick on one side. Aiding and abetting the dysfunction around here is a president who apparently thinks **arm twisting** has no place in political rough-and-tumble. How noble of him. Not only **is** it **a part of the** natural **political order**, so is eye gouging and ear biting and crotch kicking when necessary.

No less a master at that than Lyndon Johnson once told me that sitting down to reason things out always worked better when you had the other person’s arm held firmly behind his back. And Gov. Earl Long of Louisiana said that even ethics had a place in politics because “we use anything we can get our hands on.”

Yet getting four more senators from his own party to pull the lever for a crucial vote the other day apparently was undoable **for** Barack **Obama,** even when the public edge was sufficiently with him. This caused various critics to legitimately complain that **the one ingredient he lacked was forceful leadership**, the kind that makes it unequivocal that if you want something, you better give me what I want. His response was to cry shame and let it go at that.

Rehab kills Obama’s polcap. **Trinick 12** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

Reasons why criminal justice policy is ignored 1) It’s politically toxic. **Any move** to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice **is** inevitably **viewed as** being **‘soft on crime’**, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For **Democrats, especially Obama,** the **aim** appears to be **to avoid looking “weak and liberal”** and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made. 2) People don’t like to have to think about it. This relates to the point above about having to make hard choices, but there is more to it. By its very nature, criminal justice is difficult and unpleasant to think about and so most people shy away from it — who wants to think about prison and criminals when there’s the new series of Homeland? The majority of people will have no interaction with the criminal justice system, especially not on the ‘wrong’ side of it, and so they shut their eyes, pretend they cannot see the problem and hope it will go away. The politicians and media know this and cater to the demands of their audiences. 3) **Changes would require the states and the Federal government to work together. This** shouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but it **adds more complexity** to an already difficult area. Both states and the federal government maintain prisons and any systematic attempt to reduce the prison population would require co-operation and negotiation between all the parties. In gridlocked Washington, this would be unlikely even if the topic was not so politically explosive. 4) Criminal justice policy is hard. Really hard. **What should be the moral basis** for imprisoning criminals — Deterrence? **Rehabilitation?** Proportionate punishment? Public protection? **Retribution?** Economic reality? Most countries follow a mix of these, but a different balance of the justifications can alter dramatically the policy pursued in a particular jurisdiction. Agreeing on **the** precise **balance is** something **fraught with** potential for **disagreement, even among** those who have no political concerns, like **academics.** On top of this, of course, is the fact that a different weighting of the justifications can have real cost implications — for example, both rehabilitation programmes and capital punishment are hugely expensive. 5) The overlap with drug policy does not help. Realistically the only way the USA is going to reduce its prison population by a meaningful amount is either to legalise (some) drugs or to impose far lighter (non-custodial) sentences for most drug related offences. While legalisation of (some) drugs may be a good idea, it is hardly an uncontroversial one and few, if any, politicians have the gumption, or the political capital, to take on both reform of the criminal justice system and drug legalisation.

Immigration reform is key to Latin American relations which solve multiple existential risks. Now is key. **Shifter 12** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Some** enduring **problems stand** squarely **in the way of** partnership and **effective cooperation.** The **inability** of Washington **to reform** its broken **immigration** system **is a constant source of friction between the U**nited **S**tates **and** nearly **every other country in the Americas**. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations. Another chronic irritant is US drug policy, which most Latin Americans now believe makes their drug and crime problems worse. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, while visiting Mexico, acknowledged that US anti-drug programs have not worked. Yet, despite growing calls and pressure from the region, the United States has shown little interest in exploring alternative approaches. Similarly, Washington’s more than half-century embargo on Cuba, as well as other elements of United States’ Cuba policy, is strongly opposed by all other countries in the hemisphere. Indeed, the US position on these troublesome issues—immigration, drug policy, and Cuba—has set Washington against the consensus view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments. These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas . The United States and the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships. **There are compelling reasons for the U**nited **S**tates **and Latin America to pursue** more **robust ties. Every country** in the Americas **would benefit** from strengthened and expanded economic relations, **with improved access to** each other’s **markets**, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, **the U**nited **S**tates’ **$16-trillion economy is** a **vital** market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology **for Latin America**, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will** inevitably **become** more and more **crucial to the U**nited **S**tates’ **economic future. The U**nited **S**tates and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean **would** also **gain** a great deal **by more cooperation on** such **global matters as climate change**, nuclear **non-prolif**eration, and **democracy and human rights.** With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . **If new opportunities are not seized, relations** will likely **continue to drift apart** . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric **affairs require urgent attention**—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

# 1NC Focus Shell

It’s now or never for immigration reform. The bill will die absent an immediate push from the White House. **Soto 4-25** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

Opinion: **Delaying immigration reform will kill it** A hardwired instinct is to turn inwards in times of crisis. **In the** case of the recent **Boston bombings**, we see our natural emotional reactions at work – Americans are fearful, **Americans are turning inward**, and Americans are seeking **to keep strangers out.** Put it all together and immigration reform looks more and more difficult. **Immigrants are** no strangers to being the **scapegoats** of the visceral reactions that come **in times of crisis. The last 100 years have seen** several instances of Americans turning inward and not only shunning but scapegoating immigrants. To begin, there was the **internment of German and Japanese** immigrants during the World Wars. Then, during the Great Depression there were the round ups and **mass deportations of Mexican immigrants and** citizens. And **most recently** there is the **racial profiling** and harassment **Arab-Americans** have been subject to. So in the current political context, it is perfectly normal to see why there are rumblings to seal up the borders and halt immigration. But while the response to turn away from the immigrant may be a natural response it’s not a rational response. The most rational response to the domestic terror attack is to push forward immigration reform—policy that makes us safer by better tracking those immigrants who are here and who are seeking to enter. But the problem is that this type of big picture or reasoned thinking takes time to kick in. In the wake of a crisis, emotions are in the driver’s seat. Rational and level-headed thinking lags a bit behind the visceral. Herein lies the rub. In order for the rational part of our thinking to kick in, we need time. With regards to the immigration discussion, time would allow folks to see that not going through with an immigration reform makes us less safe. However, too much time is a thief of momentum. And immigration reform, as any type of complex legislation, lives and dies on momentum. What we have is a Catch-22. Time allows cooler heads to prevail. In the case of immigration reform that means seeing the likes of Rand Paul understand that pressing “pause” on immigration reform is counterproductive to our national security. But **time** also **allows** for **momentum to fizzle.** The question in moving forward with immigration reform is whether to proceed more slowly or charge ahead. Neither strategy is ideal, but the charging ahead is the lesser of two evils. **If immigration reform is** placed **on the back burner, even for a couple of weeks, it will die. There is only so much attention that law makers can give to any one area before their attention gets pulled elsewhere. Also, if lawmakers do not pass** immigration reform **before summer recess,** the **emotional voices** of those that think that immigration makes us less safe **could overpower the debate.** The last thing immigration reform needs is the health care town hall meetings from 2009. Time usually heals all. But in the case of immigration reform time turns out to be more of a foe than a friend. To see immigration reform become a reality the Gang of Eight, **the White House**, and immigration advocates **must charge forward** with their reasoned arguments highlighting the greater good of immigration reform. Now more than ever, **time is of the essence.**

The plan would shift focus from immigration which derails fast compromise.

**Politico 4-18**[[6]](#footnote-6)

Added Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.): “I never saw a president fight so hard, a vice president, never on any issue… It shows us the cowardice of the Senate.” In the end, however, **moderates and conservatives** in the upper chamber **said they** simply **couldn’t deal with a flurry of progressive issues at once — from gay marriage to immigration to guns.** The other three Democratic “no” votes — Max Baucus of Montana, Mark Pryor of Arkansas and Mark Begich of Alaska — were never really in play, sources familiar with the situation told POLITICO. **One senator told a White House official that** it was “Guns, gays and immigration - it’s too much. **I can be with you on one or two of them, but not all three.”** A glum Obama was sitting in the White House Situation Room for a previously scheduled national security briefing when news of the 54-to-46 vote broke, according to a senior administration official. Obama wasn’t watching the proceedings closely on C-SPAN because he already knew the whip count; over the last few days, the president personally lobbied most of the red and purple state Democrats and Republicans sitting on the fence, and had already vented his frustration with a handful of Democratic hold-outs who were waiting to see what other would do before committing. In a break from protocol — Obama seldom talks publicly about what other politicians say to him privately — the president called out the Senate, including members of his own party, for succumbing to bullying of the National Rifle Association in the Rose Garden about an hour after the vote. “Most of these senators couldn’t offer any good reasons… there were no coherent arguments about why we couldn’t do this… it came down to politics,” a visibly agitated Obama said, flanked by former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, a clearly shaken Vice President Joe Biden and family members of Sandy Hook victims. Senators on both sides of the aisle “caved to the pressure and started looking for an excuse, any excuse, to say no,” he said, adding that he planned to continue pushing on the issue. “I see this as round one,” Obama intoned. But privately, **administration officials were looking ahead to** the far more sanguine prospects of negotiating **a bipartisan immigration** reform **bill** — **and expressed hope that clearing the decks** on guns **would raise prospects for a faster agreement**. Despite Obama’s vow to fight on, one senior adviser to the president said “it was a fair question” to ask if Obama’s old campaign apparatus, Organizing for Action, could help create a groundswell of protest against the “no” voters in each party.

Immigration reform is key to Latin American relations which solve multiple existential risks. Now is key. **Shifter 12** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

**Some** enduring **problems stand** squarely **in the way of** partnership and **effective cooperation.** The **inability** of Washington **to reform** its broken **immigration** system **is a constant source of friction between the U**nited **S**tates **and** nearly **every other country in the Americas**. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations. Another chronic irritant is US drug policy, which most Latin Americans now believe makes their drug and crime problems worse. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, while visiting Mexico, acknowledged that US anti-drug programs have not worked. Yet, despite growing calls and pressure from the region, the United States has shown little interest in exploring alternative approaches. Similarly, Washington’s more than half-century embargo on Cuba, as well as other elements of United States’ Cuba policy, is strongly opposed by all other countries in the hemisphere. Indeed, the US position on these troublesome issues—immigration, drug policy, and Cuba—has set Washington against the consensus view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments. These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas . The United States and the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships. **There are compelling reasons for the U**nited **S**tates **and Latin America to pursue** more **robust ties. Every country** in the Americas **would benefit** from strengthened and expanded economic relations, **with improved access to** each other’s **markets**, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, **the U**nited **S**tates’ **$16-trillion economy is** a **vital** market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology **for Latin America**, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will** inevitably **become** more and more **crucial to the U**nited **S**tates’ **economic future. The U**nited **S**tates and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean **would** also **gain** a great deal **by more cooperation on** such **global matters as climate change**, nuclear **non-prolif**eration, and **democracy and human rights.** With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . **If new opportunities are not seized, relations** will likely **continue to drift apart** . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric **affairs require urgent attention**—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

# Uniqueness

## Will Pass

CIR will pass now. Bipartisan and presidential support.

**Free Enterprise 4-26** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

Sens. Lindsay **Graham** (R-SC) **and** John **McCain** (R-AZ), the two lead negotiators in the Senate’s Gang of Eight immigration reform group, said that they **believe their** immigration reform **bill will** not just **have** a filibuster proof majority in the Senate—but majority **support from both parties and the president. “We have met with the president and he supports strongly our efforts.** He doesn’t agree with every part of the bill, but he recognizes that it is a careful compromise with concessions on all sides,” McCain said. Both senators spoke at the U.S. Chamber’s Reforming Immigration for a Better America event on April 26. (watch the webcast).

McCain acknowledged that there would be changes to the Senate bill, “This is the end of the beginning, not the beginning of the end.” The most contentious provisions, Graham said, will be around low and high-skilled visa programs and access to legal labor. “There will be efforts from the left and the right,” to change the caps on those workers.

The new W Visa for low-skilled workers would start at 20,000 and eventually reach 200,000. The Senate bill also raises the national cap on employment visas for high-skilled foreigners from 65,000 per year to 110,000 per year, with the ability to rise to 180,000 per year under certain economic circumstances.

Nevertheless, **both senators expressed confidence that the bill would pass the Senate with 70 votes, building momentum for House passage.**

Rep. Ted Poe, vice chairman of the House immigration subcommittee and chair of the House Immigration Reform Caucus, said he had misgivings about the Senate approach to dealing with a massive immigration bill and thinks a better way is to have several smaller measures addressing different aspects. He expects the House to deal with as many as 5 to 8 separate, smaller immigration bills, starting with the definition of what constitutes “operational control” of a secure border. “We must methodically look at each of the various components that need to be fixed before we move on,” Poe said.

Business leaders attending the Chamber event, including Mark Peters of Caterpillar Inc., Robin Paulino of Microsoft, and Ken Kimbro of Tyson Foods Inc., voiced support for the Senate proposal. “There is a strong, collective voice from the business community on this issue,” said Peter Schiron, assistant general counsel at Deloitte LLP.

“There is no doubt that there will be additional input and analysis through Senate hearings and amendments. That’s how it should be. We support a transparent and open process and debate,” Chamber President and CEO Tom Donohue told the packed room. “**Given the broad support** this bill has garnered **from business** and labor … from conservatives and liberals … and from **faith-based and civil groups,** I’m optimistic that **this time we have an excellent chance** at getting immigration reform done.”

CIR Will Pass; Widespread Public And Coalition Support. **Kelly, 4/25:[[9]](#footnote-9)**

Sens. John **McCain and** Chuck **Schumer** said Thursday that they **believe they can win** as many as **70 votes to pass** comprehensive **immigration reform** in the Senate — a show of force that could help sway the reluctant House to pass the bill. “We need that, and I think it’s doable,” said McCain, R-Ariz., at a newsmaker breakfast sponsored by The Christian Science Monitor. The senators, members of the so-called “Gang of Eight” that negotiated the sweeping bipartisan immigration bill introduced this month, also predicted that gun legislation expanding background checks will be resurrected despite its recent defeat in the Senate. While gun control failed this month, McCain and Schumer see hope in the fact that opponents failed to mount a successful filibuster to block the bill from coming to a vote. The background check bill won the vote of 54 senators, but it required 60 votes to pass. “I think we’re at a turning point,” said Schumer, D-N.Y., saying that recent mass shootings in Newtown, Conn., and elsewhere will continue to put public pressure on Congress to act. Schumer said he believes the gun-control bill — with some possible tweaking — will come to a vote again before the end of the year. “I agree with Chuck; I think the issue is going to come back,” said McCain, who was one of four Republicans who voted for the background bill. The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013, is slated for discussion and amendment in the Senate Judiciary Committee beginning on May 9 before moving to a vote of the full Senate as early as June. The committee already has held three hearings on the measure. Schumer, D-N.Y., said he is confident that supporters of the bill will attract the 60 votes needed to prevent opponents from mounting a filibuster to kill it. But he said he believes **supporters can** go beyond that to **attract** **enough Republican support to get to 70 votes and impress the** GOP-led **House enough to act.** **The reason** for their optimism, McCain said, **is the broad coalition** of interest groups supporting the bill, **including labor unions, the** U.S. **Chamber of Commerce,** evangelical **Protestants and the Catholic Church.** “It is a coalition we did not have in 2007,” said McCain, who helped lead a failed effort at reform that year. A poll released Thursday by the Winston Group showed that **67 percent of Republican voters support the** bipartisan **bill.**

CIR Will Pass Now; Every Indicator Goes My Way. **Vargas, 4/25:[[10]](#footnote-10)**

Inside the Beltway, **immigration is the single-most issue to capture** the **bipartisan support** of a deadlocked Congress. While the federal budget and the gun control debate each seem to be replete with heated politics, immigration has been a welcome civil debate. Just **last week,** major components were resolved and **the news** cycle **was filled with** leading **Democrats and Republicans projecting progress** to the American people. But now that legislation has been introduced in the Senate, will Texas Republican U.S. Sen. John Cornyn stand in the way of immigration reform? Since 2005, Sen. Cornyn has had a record of defeating reform efforts while portraying himself as a fighter to fix the country's outdated immigration system. At the 2011 Hispanic Leadership Network conference, Cornyn said, "They (Democrats) have controlled Congress for four years, have occupied the White House for two years, and yet they've broken every promise to lead on immigration reform." And last month, while accepting the "Small Business Advocate of the Year" award from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Cornyn talked about the need to fix our broken immigration system. And yet, Cornyn in 2010 voted against the DREAM Act - a bill that would provide a path to legal status for certain undocumented students - and recently introduced a "border security only" bill despite the country's overwhelming support for a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Indeed, **the** "Gang of 8" **legislation addresses** many, if not all, of Cornyn's demands for **border security.** Under the proposed legislation, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security must create, fund and begin a border security plan within six months. DHS will receive billions of dollars to fund border security enhancements. For interior enforcement, the bill requires U.S. employers to implement E-Verify; government officials will have to set up an exit/entry system to track foreign visitors or workers who overstay their visas. Further, Republican Sens. John McCain and Jeff Flake, both from the border state of Arizona, have pressed for heightened security measures in the compromise. There is minimal excuse for Cornyn to join anti-immigrant voices to halt progress. Cornyn will very likely face a re-election bid in which he will face a challenger from the tea party. As a result, Cornyn has been taking stances further and further to the right. This isn't too dissimilar from what occurred in the 2012 election cycle: After an unpleasant purging of candidates such as the very experienced Sen. Dick Lugar, R-Ind., in favor of the un-electable Richard Mourdock, Republicans took that brand of extremism to the polls and it didn't fare well in November. Cornyn can still win his primary. But he will incur the wrath of Texas Latino voters, whose dissatisfaction with the senator will only continue to grow between now and the general election, if he maintains an obstructionist stance on immigration reform. Many will rethink their alliance with Texas Republicans. The writing is on the wall that **the environment for** immigration **reform has never been better**, nor the conditions more demanding to ramp down the costly enforcement and embrace the young, working demographic that is roughly five times more likely to start their own business. The **public interest for** comprehensive immigration **reform is broad.** For instance, New York Mayor Michael **Bloomberg** has **focused on the benefits to the economy** of reforming immigration. **Silicon Valley**, meanwhile, led by people like Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg, **is** jumping into the mix **in support** of humane and practical immigration reform.

CIR will pass now. Bipartisan support. **The Hill 4-24**[[11]](#footnote-11)

Publicly, **members voiced optimism about reaching an agreement. Gutiérrez will join a Republican** negotiator**, Rep.** John **Carter** (R-Texas), **for an event** in San Antonio, Texas, **to build support for immigration reform.** It will come a week after Gutiérrez made a joint appearance to discuss the topic in Chicago with Rep. Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), and it will be the first time two members of the House group will appear together in public. **“We’re almost there,” Carter said.** Carter would not rule out releasing a final bill before Monday, but several other officials with knowledge of the negotiations said it was unlikely the legislation would be finished before May. The coalition only formally acknowledged its existence — which had been an open secret in Washington since the beginning of the year — last week after the Gang of Eight released its legislative text. “We didn’t come out of the closet. We were dragged out,” Carter joked. **The four Democratic members of the group briefed the House Democratic caucus on Wednesday. “This isn’t a Democratic bill. This is a compromise bill**,” Gutiérrez warned his colleagues, according to a person in the closed-door meeting. Frank Sharry, a reform advocate and executive director of America’s Voice, said he has more concerns about the possible differences with the Senate on the guest-worker program than on the path to citizenship. The Senate deal won the support of both the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO. Fighting between the two sides in 2007 has been blamed for the failure of immigration reform legislation during the George W. Bush administration. “Minor differences with respect to the path to citizenship wouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but changes to the business-labor deal might well be. There is no wiggle room,” Sharry said. “If [Republicans] demand too much, they could easily upset the delicate balance the Senate bill represents.” With a conservative Republican majority, the way forward for immigration reform in the House is more uncertain than in the Senate. GOP leaders have not decided whether to move a single bill or break it into pieces to improve its chances for passage. Leaders of the House Judiciary Committee, who have reacted coolly to the Senate proposal, plan to detail their plans for legislation on Thursday morning. A Democrat in the House immigration group, Rep. Xavier Becerra (Calif.), cited the indecision of the Republican leadership as an obstacle. “Unfortunately, on the House side, it looks like some Republicans are getting tied up in knots. I’m not sure how they want to proceed,” Becerra, chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, said during a press briefing in the Capitol. But he also suggested that **the eight members in the coalition had never been closer to a deal “than we are today.”**

## PolCap Key

Polcap’s key to overcome new anti-terror concerns from the Boston Bombing.

**Thomasson 4-27** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

**The turn-back-the-clock caucus wants to make sure no more** mad **bombers can cross our borders**, like the two who blew up the Boston Marathon, killing three and maiming many. The only problem with that, of course, is that both the suspects — the one who was killed in a shootout, and his younger brother, who was badly wounded and found hiding in a boat in a driveway — were here legally and really didn’t cross any borders. The older brother was even interviewed by the FBI and nominated by the CIA for a government terror watch list, and nothing untoward was found.

Those who really don’t want much except a Chinese-like wall built along our southern border to keep out the perceived riff raff are saying we should reassess an arduously negotiated compromise immigration bill in light of the Boston massacre. They would find some other reason to trash the proposal if the bombing had never taken place. Besides, once you’ve forced all the undocumented to leave, who would be left to build the wall? That’s an old question that is more and more valid.

**Egging on the** self-styled **libertarians** and contrarians in Congress **are the professional dissenters** — those ubiquitous nay saying blabber mouths on radio who incite to riot nearly any chance they get. I mean, there is good money in that nihilist shtick, what with all the paranoids running around waving semi- automatic assault weapons — or hiding under their beds when they aren’t running to the phone to shout, “Kudos to that.”

I’m sorry, but when I first began observing those charged with carrying out the public’s business nearly 60 years of journalism ago, there was some sanity in the conducting of it. Sure, there were crazies then, too, but most people ultimately recognized their diatribes as utterly counterproductive in the end. There were spirited differences in the legislature, but as dusk fell the parties involved were willing to take a chance on putting them aside for the good of all.

But I don’t just want to pick on one side. Aiding and abetting the dysfunction around here is a president who apparently thinks **arm twisting** has no place in political rough-and-tumble. How noble of him. Not only **is** it **a part of the** natural **political order**, so is eye gouging and ear biting and crotch kicking when necessary.

No less a master at that than Lyndon Johnson once told me that sitting down to reason things out always worked better when you had the other person’s arm held firmly behind his back. And Gov. Earl Long of Louisiana said that even ethics had a place in politics because “we use anything we can get our hands on.”

Yet getting four more senators from his own party to pull the lever for a crucial vote the other day apparently was undoable **for** Barack **Obama,** even when the public edge was sufficiently with him. This caused various critics to legitimately complain that **the one ingredient he lacked was forceful leadership**, the kind that makes it unequivocal that if you want something, you better give me what I want. His response was to cry shame and let it go at that.

Obama’s polcap is key. **NPR 4-17**[[13]](#footnote-13)

If **Obama** couldn't get an important win in a Democratic-controlled Senate on a measure that had overwhelming public support, according to polls, what's in store for other issues? "He**'s using pol**itical **cap**ital, and when you use political capital this way and you lose, it hurts," **said James Thurber, a**n American University **poli**tical **sci**ence **professor** and director of the school's Center for Presidential and Congressional Studies. But, Thurber added: "There will be new policies, new events that will come that will help him. He isn't a total lame duck, even though it's his second term. **He still has a lot of power** in certain areas**,** and **certainly in** the area of **immigration he's going to have** some **leverage in terms of helping** to **bring a bill through the Senate and** the **House."**

It’s now or never. The will only pass with an immediate White House push.

**Soto 4-25** writes[[14]](#footnote-14)

Opinion: **Delaying immigration reform will kill it** A hardwired instinct is to turn inwards in times of crisis. **In the** case of the recent **Boston bombings**, we see our natural emotional reactions at work – Americans are fearful, **Americans are turning inward**, and Americans are seeking **to keep strangers out.** Put it all together and immigration reform looks more and more difficult. Immigrants are no strangers to being the scapegoats of the visceral reactions that come in times of crisis. The last 100 years have seen several instances of Americans turning inward and not only shunning but scapegoating immigrants. To begin, there was the internment of German and Japanese immigrants during the World Wars. Then, during the Great Depression there were the round ups and mass deportations of Mexican immigrants and citizens. And most recently there is the racial profiling and harassment Arab-Americans have been subject to. So in the current political context, it is perfectly normal to see why there are rumblings to seal up the borders and halt immigration. But while the response to turn away from the immigrant may be a natural response it’s not a rational response. The most rational response to the domestic terror attack is to push forward immigration reform—policy that makes us safer by better tracking those immigrants who are here and who are seeking to enter. But the problem is that this type of big picture or reasoned thinking takes time to kick in. In the wake of a crisis, emotions are in the driver’s seat. Rational and level-headed thinking lags a bit behind the visceral. Herein lies the rub. In order for the rational part of our thinking to kick in, we need time. With regards to the immigration discussion, time would allow folks to see that not going through with an immigration reform makes us less safe. However, too much time is a thief of momentum. And immigration reform, as any type of complex legislation, lives and dies on momentum. What we have is a Catch-22. Time allows cooler heads to prevail. In the case of immigration reform that means seeing the likes of Rand Paul understand that pressing “pause” on immigration reform is counterproductive to our national security. But **time** also **allows** for **momentum to fizzle.** The question in moving forward with immigration reform is whether to proceed more slowly or charge ahead. Neither strategy is ideal, but the charging ahead is the lesser of two evils. **If immigration reform is** placed **on the back burner, even for a couple of weeks, it will die. There is only so much attention that law makers can give to any one area before their attention gets pulled elsewhere.** Also, if lawmakers do not pass immigration reform before summer recess, the emotional voices of those that think that immigration makes us less safe could overpower the debate. The last thing immigration reform needs is the health care town hall meetings from 2009. Time usually heals all. But in the case of immigration reform time turns out to be more of a foe than a friend. To see immigration reform become a reality the Gang of Eight, **the White House**, and immigration advocates **must charge forward** with their reasoned arguments highlighting the greater good of immigration reform. Now more than ever, **time is of the essence.**

## AT Visas Solve

It’s full bill or no bill. Schumer agrees visas alone can’t pass. **Reuters 3-5** writes[[15]](#footnote-15)

Senator Charles **Schumer**, a member of a bipartisan group crafting comprehensive U.S. immigration reform, **urged** technology **firms** on Tuesday **to stop lobbying for a standalone bill on high-skilled** **immigrants, saying** such narrow legislation **would not pass.**

“**You will not get a bill unless there’s a full immigration bill**,” the New York Democrat said at an event hosted by the Internet Alliance lobby group. “**The best thing you can do** now **is not lobby on the high-skilled end.”**

Comprehensive reform is key. Visas alone won’t happen. **Helper 2-19** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

The **New York Times reported** last week that **policymakers are still debating** the option of rolling the **stand-alone bills** for tech talent into a broader immigration reform measure.

“**The odds of high-skilled passing without comprehensive is close to zero**, and the odds of comprehensive passing without high-skilled passing is close to zero,” Robert D. Atkinson, **president of the nonpartisan I**nformation **T**echnology and **I**nnovation **F**oundation, **told the Times.**

Democrats won’t pass anything less than full path to citizenship.

**Helderman 1-31** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

Rising tensions over whether to give illegal immigrants a chance to pursue full citizenship could ruin what President Obama and congressional leaders agree is a pivotal moment in resolving long-simmering problems in the country’s immigration system.¶ Immigrant advocates and their **Democrat**ic allie**s** insist that now, at long last, is their time. After various failed proposals over the past decade, they finally **feel they have** the **leverage to accept nothing less than a path to full citizenship** for the millions of people living illegally in the country.¶ But although Republican leaders are newly interested in a compromise on immigration, many in the party say that allowing undocumented immigrants to live here legally is enough and that a push for citizenship would face fierce, and possibly insurmountable, opposition from conservatives.¶ The tension has deepened in recent days, with disagreements emerging within each party as bipartisan groups in the House and the Senate try to move toward a compromise even as they face hard-line opposition from some voices in their political bases.¶ On the right, some conservatives have begun heaping criticism on one of their own rising stars, Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), the Cuban American who is a potential presidential candidate and who is championing a compromise. On the left, some liberals are privately grousing that Democratic senators working with Rubio are giving too much ground.¶ A key question is whether to require that certain conditions be met before illegal immigrants could be put on the path to citizenship — and how the government would determine success.¶ The Senate group, which includes Rubio and top members of both parties, would require that the U.S.-Mexico border be found secure and that other strict enforcement measures be enacted before those here illegally could become citizens. Many on the left say the path needs to be more straightforward, while many on the right see even the compromise idea as a non-starter, deeming it too lenient.¶ A path to citizenship is “certainly going to be a problem in the House,” said Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which will hold a hearing next week on the issue. “There are a lot of options between deporting 11 million people, which most people don’t believe will happen, and giving [them] citizenship.”¶ On the other side, Richard Trumka, president of the AFL-CIO, said he would support only legislation that gives every deserving illegal immigrant a chance at citizenship. “If it’s too exclusionary, then we’ll fight against it,” he said.¶ **The tensions underscore** the **difficulty of forging consensus** on such a politically charged issue, **even after Obama’s decisive** election **win** last year among Hispanics led several prominent Republicans to express an eagerness to strike a deal.¶ The senators behind the framework — Republicans Rubio, John McCain (Ariz.), Jeff Flake (Ariz.) and Lindsey O. Graham (S.C.), along with Democrats Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.), Richard J. Durbin (Ill.), Robert Menendez (N.J.) and Michael F. Bennet (Colo.) — have been exuding confidence that a deal was within reach.¶ “I’ve never felt more positive about the prospects of real immigration reform than I do today,” Durbin said at a news conference Thursday.¶ Yet even if the senators find agreement among themselves, selling their recommendations to their colleagues and the activists on both sides of the debate will be a far steeper challenge.¶ Immigration advocates close to the White House have vowed to pressure Obama if he agrees to what they consider unreasonable preconditions to citizenship for illegal immigrants. Conservatives are either insisting on strict contingencies or refusing to back the idea of citizenship.¶ “The world now thinks that this is inevitable,” said one person with knowledge of the deliberations who spoke on the condition of anonymity. “**This is far from inevitable. There’s a million land mines in the way.”**

# Links

## Long Link

Rehab kills Obama’s polcap. **Trinick 12** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

Reasons why criminal justice policy is ignored **1)** It’s politically toxic. **Any move** to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice **is** inevitably **viewed as** being **‘soft on crime’, regardless of** how much sense a new policy might make or **how much it might reduce crime** in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For **Democrats, especially Obama,** the **aim** appears to be **to avoid looking “weak and liberal”** and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made. **2) People don’t like to** have to **think about it.** This relates to the point above about having to make hard choices, but there is more to it. By its very nature, criminal justice is difficult and unpleasant to think about and so most people shy away from it — who wants to think about prison and criminals when there’s the new series of Homeland? The majority of **people** will **have no interaction with the c**riminal **j**ustice **s**ystem, especially not on the ‘wrong’ side of it, and **so they shut their eyes**, pretend they cannot see the problem and hope it will go away. The politicians and media know this and cater to the demands of their audiences. **3) Changes would require the states and the Federal government to work together.** This shouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but **it adds more complexity** to an already difficult area. **Both states and the f**ederal **g**overnment **maintain prisons** and **any** systematic **attempt** to reduce the prison population **would require co-operation and negotiation** between all the parties. In gridlocked Washington, this would be unlikely even if the topic was not so politically explosive. **4)** Criminal justice policy is hard. Really hard. **What should be the moral basis** for imprisoning criminals — Deterrence? **Rehabilitation?** Proportionate punishment? Public protection? **Retribution?** Economic reality? Most countries follow a mix of these, but a different balance of the justifications can alter dramatically the policy pursued in a particular jurisdiction. Agreeing on **the** precise **balance is** something **fraught with** potential for **disagreement, even among** those who have no political concerns, like **academics.** On top of this, of course, is the fact that a different weighting of the justifications can have real cost implications — for example, both rehabilitation programmes and capital punishment are hugely expensive. **5) The overlap with drug policy does not help.** Realistically the only way the USA is going to reduce its prison population by a meaningful amount is either to legalise (some) drugs or to impose far lighter (non-custodial) sentences for most drug related offences. While legalisation of (some) drugs may be a good idea, it is hardly an uncontroversial one and few, if any, politicians have the gumption, or the political capital, to take on both reform of the criminal justice system and drug legalisation.

## Short link

Rehab kills Obama’s polcap. **Trinick 12** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

Reasons why criminal justice policy is ignored 1) It’s politically toxic. **Any move** to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice **is** inevitably **viewed as** being **‘soft on crime’**, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For **Democrats, especially Obama,** the **aim** appears to be **to avoid looking “weak and liberal”** and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made. 2) People don’t like to have to think about it. This relates to the point above about having to make hard choices, but there is more to it. By its very nature, criminal justice is difficult and unpleasant to think about and so most people shy away from it — who wants to think about prison and criminals when there’s the new series of Homeland? The majority of people will have no interaction with the criminal justice system, especially not on the ‘wrong’ side of it, and so they shut their eyes, pretend they cannot see the problem and hope it will go away. The politicians and media know this and cater to the demands of their audiences. 3) **Changes would require the states and the Federal government to work together. This** shouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but it **adds more complexity** to an already difficult area. Both states and the federal government maintain prisons and any systematic attempt to reduce the prison population would require co-operation and negotiation between all the parties. In gridlocked Washington, this would be unlikely even if the topic was not so politically explosive. 4) Criminal justice policy is hard. Really hard. **What should be the moral basis** for imprisoning criminals — Deterrence? **Rehabilitation?** Proportionate punishment? Public protection? **Retribution?** Economic reality? Most countries follow a mix of these, but a different balance of the justifications can alter dramatically the policy pursued in a particular jurisdiction. Agreeing on **the** precise **balance is** something **fraught with** potential for **disagreement, even among** those who have no political concerns, like **academics.** On top of this, of course, is the fact that a different weighting of the justifications can have real cost implications — for example, both rehabilitation programmes and capital punishment are hugely expensive. 5) The overlap with drug policy does not help. Realistically the only way the USA is going to reduce its prison population by a meaningful amount is either to legalise (some) drugs or to impose far lighter (non-custodial) sentences for most drug related offences. While legalisation of (some) drugs may be a good idea, it is hardly an uncontroversial one and few, if any, politicians have the gumption, or the political capital, to take on both reform of the criminal justice system and drug legalisation.

## No implementation link

Valuing rehab kills Obama’s polcap. **Trinick 12** writes[[20]](#footnote-20)

Reasons why criminal justice policy is ignored 1) It’s politically toxic. **Any move to alter the** current **tough stance** on criminal justice **is** inevitably **viewed as** being **‘soft on crime’**, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For **Democrats, especially Obama,** the **aim** appears to be **to avoid looking “weak and liberal”** and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made. 2) People don’t like to have to think about it. This relates to the point above about having to make hard choices, but there is more to it. By its very nature, criminal justice is difficult and unpleasant to think about and so most people shy away from it — who wants to think about prison and criminals when there’s the new series of Homeland? The majority of people will have no interaction with the criminal justice system, especially not on the ‘wrong’ side of it, and so they shut their eyes, pretend they cannot see the problem and hope it will go away. The politicians and media know this and cater to the demands of their audiences. 3) Changes would require the states and the Federal government to work together. This shouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but it adds more complexity to an already difficult area. **Both states and the federal government maintain prisons** and any systematic attempt to reduce the prison population would require co-operation and negotiation between all the parties. In gridlocked Washington, this would be unlikely even if the topic was not so politically explosive. 4) Criminal justice policy is hard. Really hard. **What should be the moral basis** for imprisoning criminals — Deterrence? **Rehabilitation?** Proportionate punishment? Public protection? **Retribution?** Economic reality? Most countries follow a mix of these, but a different balance of the justifications can alter dramatically the policy pursued in a particular jurisdiction. **Agreeing on the** precise **balance is** something **fraught with** potential for **disagreement, even among** those who have no political concerns, like **academics.** On top of this, of course, is the fact that a **different weighting of** the **justifications can have real cost implications** — for example, both rehabilitation programmes and capital punishment are hugely expensive.

## Focus Link

Independently, the plan would shift focus from immigration which kills the bill. **Politico 4-18**[[21]](#footnote-21)

Added Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.): “I never saw a president fight so hard, a vice president, never on any issue… It shows us the cowardice of the Senate.” In the end, however, **moderates and conservatives** in the upper chamber **said they** simply **couldn’t deal with a flurry of progressive issues at once — from gay marriage to immigration to guns.** The other three Democratic “no” votes — Max Baucus of Montana, Mark Pryor of Arkansas and Mark Begich of Alaska — were never really in play, sources familiar with the situation told POLITICO. **One senator told a White House official that** it was “Guns, gays and immigration - it’s too much. **I can be with you on one or two of them, but not all three.”** A glum Obama was sitting in the White House Situation Room for a previously scheduled national security briefing when news of the 54-to-46 vote broke, according to a senior administration official. Obama wasn’t watching the proceedings closely on C-SPAN because he already knew the whip count; over the last few days, the president personally lobbied most of the red and purple state Democrats and Republicans sitting on the fence, and had already vented his frustration with a handful of Democratic hold-outs who were waiting to see what other would do before committing. In a break from protocol — Obama seldom talks publicly about what other politicians say to him privately — the president called out the Senate, including members of his own party, for succumbing to bullying of the National Rifle Association in the Rose Garden about an hour after the vote. “Most of these senators couldn’t offer any good reasons… there were no coherent arguments about why we couldn’t do this… it came down to politics,” a visibly agitated Obama said, flanked by former Rep. Gabrielle Giffords, a clearly shaken Vice President Joe Biden and family members of Sandy Hook victims. Senators on both sides of the aisle “caved to the pressure and started looking for an excuse, any excuse, to say no,” he said, adding that he planned to continue pushing on the issue. “I see this as round one,” Obama intoned. But privately, **administration officials were looking ahead to** the far more sanguine prospects of negotiating **a bipartisan immigration** reform **bill** — **and expressed hope that clearing the decks** on guns **would raise prospects for a faster agreement**. Despite Obama’s vow to fight on, one senior adviser to the president said “it was a fair question” to ask if Obama’s old campaign apparatus, Organizing for Action, could help create a groundswell of protest against the “no” voters in each party.

## Healthcare Link

Prison education programs are unpopular. **Nielson 11** writes[[22]](#footnote-22)

What do we do about those who commit crimes? This questions seems to have a more definitive answer in the US. **The last four decades** of American criminal justice **have been shaped by** the **public appeal to get tough on crime** (Colgan, 2006). "Since the mid-1970s, the United States has engaged in a "race to incarcerate" that has resulted in a prison population expanded to a level previously unknown in any democratic society" (Burt, 2010). The US has over 2 million of its citizens incarcerated, which accounts for 25% of the world's imprisoned population (Forman, 2011). The system has grown seven fold since the 70's and continues to expand steadily every year (Forman, 2011; Colgan, 2006). "(T)here are various types and divisions of prisons in the United States including county jails, state prisons and federal prisons, all of which are further delineated based on minimum, medium, and maximum security. Nonetheless, and despite this uniformity, prison populations have increased at all levels" (Kendrick, 2011). Our incarceration rates are "five to ten times higher than the rates in other industrialized nations" (Chemerinsky, 2008). The US is in the middle of an unique prison crisis.

**Prisoners are not popular** topic politically **and** generally prisoners **have little political power. Many felons are permanently disenfranchised. There is no** political **constituency with the clout to "pressure** for sufficient funding **for prison** facilities or **prison services"** (Chemerinsky, 2008). **Prison guards and their unions are powerful, but they** often **argue for more prison time** and not for improving prison conditions (Chemerinsky, 2008). **Political rhetoric turns prison programs into a target by framing** education and **health care as coddling inmates** who do not deserve tools for life improvement or even basic life sustaining care (Colgan, 2006). As a result, prisoners often do not have adequate medical, mental heath care, educational programs, and facility access. The vast majority of Americans say if they knew someone was going to be incarcerated, they would be concerned for that person's physical healthy & safety and health (Dolovich, 2009). The conditions of the prison are not just a question of quality of life, but also often literally a question of life and death (Zyl Smit, 2010).

## Education Link

Prison healthcare is unpopular. **Nielson 11** writes[[23]](#footnote-23)

What do we do about those who commit crimes? This questions seems to have a more definitive answer in the US. **The last four decades** of American criminal justice **have been shaped by** the **public appeal to get tough on crime** (Colgan, 2006). "Since the mid-1970s, the United States has engaged in a "race to incarcerate" that has resulted in a prison population expanded to a level previously unknown in any democratic society" (Burt, 2010). The US has over 2 million of its citizens incarcerated, which accounts for 25% of the world's imprisoned population (Forman, 2011). The system has grown seven fold since the 70's and continues to expand steadily every year (Forman, 2011; Colgan, 2006). "(T)here are various types and divisions of prisons in the United States including county jails, state prisons and federal prisons, all of which are further delineated based on minimum, medium, and maximum security. Nonetheless, and despite this uniformity, prison populations have increased at all levels" (Kendrick, 2011). Our incarceration rates are "five to ten times higher than the rates in other industrialized nations" (Chemerinsky, 2008). The US is in the middle of an unique prison crisis.

**Prisoners are not popular** topic politically **and** generally prisoners **have little political power. Many felons are permanently disenfranchised. There is no** political **constituency with the clout to "pressure** for sufficient funding **for prison** facilities or **prison services"** (Chemerinsky, 2008). **Prison guards and their unions are powerful, but they** often **argue for more prison time** and not for improving prison conditions (Chemerinsky, 2008). **Political rhetoric turns prison programs into a target by framing education** and health care **as coddling inmates** who do not deserve tools for life improvement or even basic life sustaining care (Colgan, 2006). As a result, prisoners often do not have adequate medical, mental heath care, educational programs, and facility access. The vast majority of Americans say if they knew someone was going to be incarcerated, they would be concerned for that person's physical healthy & safety and health (Dolovich, 2009). The conditions of the prison are not just a question of quality of life, but also often literally a question of life and death (Zyl Smit, 2010).

## Green Jobs Link

Green jobs link to politics. **Fox 12** writes[[24]](#footnote-24)

The **Obama** administration on Wednesday **acknowledged** a wide-ranging definition of **“green jobs” that include**s **bus driver, bicycle-shop clerk and other unexpected lines of employment, which the chairman of the GOP-led House oversight committee said is being done for “clearly political purposes.”**

GOP Rep. Darrell Issa, chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, made the assertion during a hearing on how the administration counts so-called green jobs and the Labor Department’s recent change to how reporters can access key unemployment reports and other information.

The Labor Department "has jeopardized the integrity of employment data in some cases for clearly political reasons," he said.

Issa suggested the administration is reclassifying such jobs to prove that billions of taxpayer dollars, through the federal stimulus program, have created green, or environmentally-focused jobs – a major initiative for President Obama.

**“It’s about politics. It’s always been about politics,”** said Issa, R-Calif. **“If you work at the Salvation Army, that’s a green job.”**

## Pell Grants Link

The Plan is unpopular in Congress and massively drains capital. **Travis 11**[[25]](#footnote-25)

Ideally, our community‐based programs would be linked to a strong suite of prison‐based programs, but we face the congressional ban on funding college‐level programs.  I think the time is right for a national re‐examination of that ban.  The enactment of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (signed into law in April of 2008) has demonstrated the strong bi‐partisan support for federal leadership on ways that promote successful prisoner reentry. Granted, **the effort to restore Pell Grants faces an uphill battle.  At a time when** funding for public universities is being cut back, and **the tuition burden faced by our students is being increased, it will be very, very difficult to persuade Congress to restore Pell funding.**  But we must make this effort.  We have many good arguments on our side.  First, **the amount of money in question is modest**. When the Pell Grants for prisoners were eliminated in 1994, the funding for students in prison represented a small amount, $34 million representing less than 1/10 of 1 percent of all Pell grants, which totaled $5.3 billion (Karpowitz and Kenner 2001).  Second, as noted above, the reductions in recidivism are significant, and the programs are cost‐effective, so this investment of federal dollars would save money for states and localities.  **Yet** we must face the reality that **these arguments are not likely to carry the day.**

## AT Spending Turns the Link

Tough-on-crime is popular. Cost is irrelevant.

**Gudrais 13** writes[[26]](#footnote-26)

Some say the “prison-industrial complex”—those who work at prisons, sell goods to prisons, and benefit from cheap prisoner labor—has become a large and powerful lobby that prevents change. Western believes this argument is “oversold,” and the real explanation is simpler: **for all the dissatisfaction with** the amount of **money spent on prisons, tough-on-crime arguments are still popular. “If** the **crime** rate **drops, people say, ‘see, prisons work.** We have to spend more money on them,’” explains Marieke Liem. Conversely, “**If** the **crime** rate **rises, people say, ‘We have to spend more money on prisons.’**” Western seeks to broaden the options.

# Impacts

## Soft Power Impact

Immigration reform is key to soft power. **Nye 12**[[27]](#footnote-27)

Equally important are **immigration**’s **benefits** for **America’s soft power. The fact that people want to come to the US enhances its appeal**, and immigrants’ upward mobility is attractive to people in other countries. The US is a magnet, and many people can envisage themselves as Americans, in part because so many successful Americans look like them. Moreover, **connections between immigrants and their families** and friends **back home** help to **convey accurate and positive information about the US.**

[CommentsView/Create comment on this paragraph](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye)Likewise, **because the presence of many cultures creates** avenues of **connection with other countries, it** helps to **broaden[s] Americans’** attitudes and **views of the world** in an era of globalization. Rather than diluting hard and soft power, immigration enhances [it] both.

[CommentsView/Create comment on this paragraph](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye)Singapore’s former leader, Lee Kwan Yew, an astute observer of both the US and China, argues that China will not surpass the US as the leading power of the twenty-first century, precisely because **the US attracts the best and brightest from the rest of the world** and melds them **into a diverse culture of creativity.** China has a larger population to recruit from domestically, but, in Lee’s view, its Sino-centric culture will make it less creative than the US.

[CommentsView/Create comment on this paragraph](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/obama-needs-immigration-reform-to-maintain-america-s-strength-by-joseph-s--nye)That is a view that Americans should take to heart. **If Obama succeeds in enacting immigration reform in his second term, he will** have gone a long way toward fulfilling his promise to **maintain the strength of the US.**

Soft power solves multiple scenarios for extinction. **Nye and Armitage 07**[[28]](#footnote-28)

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. **If a** people or **nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead** without using threats and bribes. **Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to**—and the costs of—**using hard power when the situation demands.** Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, **threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of** widespread physical harm to the planet posed by **nuclear catastrophe** has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat **will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases.** The potential security challenges posed by **climate change raise[s]** the possibility of an entirely **new** set of **threats** for the United States **to consider**… **States** and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those **who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk.** China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. **Terrorists depend on** their ability to attract **support from the crowd** at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight.

## Deficit Impact

Path to citizenship solves the deficit. **Tucker 10** writes[[29]](#footnote-29)

Recommendations for taming the deficit include raising the retirement age, raising the federal gas tax and ending the mortgage interest deduction for homeowners. Ouch!¶ But there is a palliative that would ease the pain: Put 11 million illegal immigrants on a path to legalization. And don’t touch birthright citizenship!¶ Yes, you heard that right: **Granting** legal **residency to illegal** immigrant**s will** eventually help **sop up** some of **the** federal **budget’s red ink**. I know that’s counterintuitive since so many citizens have come to believe that Mexican landscapers and Guatemalan maids are a drain on the treasury. But the fact is that **their** relative **youth is** just **what the** U.S. **economy needs**.¶ The **explosion of** the long-term **deficit is** largely **the consequence of** an **aging population, with more retirees depending on taxes from fewer workers.** While the recession, two unfunded wars and Bush-era tax cuts fueled the immediate deficit, a tsunami of long-term red ink will swamp the budget in about ten years, as a massive wave of baby boomers leaves the workplace.¶ So we need as many younger workers as we can find to help support the coming crush of senior citizens. The U.S. is lucky enough to have a higher birthrate than many other Westernized democracies, even among native-born women. Immigrants are an added demographic bonus.¶ “When some people think of immigrants, they think of people coming in and immediately absorbing our resources,” said Emory economist Jeffrey Rosensweig. “Most **immigrants come here to work**. They’re young workers, and they’re paying taxes.” **Why not add** all of **them to the** federal **tax rolls?**

Deficit reduction solves extinction. **Khalilzad 11** writes[[30]](#footnote-30)

**Without** faster economic growth and **actions to reduce deficits**, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual **interest payments** — which already are larger than the defense budget — **would crowd out other spending** or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-**debt crisis** that **would** almost certainly **compel** a **radical retrenchment** of the United States internationally.¶ **Such** scenarios **would reshape the international order.** It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. **If the** U.S. **debt problem goes critical, the U**nited **S**tates **would be compelled to** retrench, **reduc**ing its **military spending and shed**ding **international commitments**.¶ We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. **The closing** of the **gap** between the United States and its rivals **could intensify** geopolitical **competition among major powers,** increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation.¶ The stakes are high. In modern history, **the longest** period of **peace among** the **great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership.** By contrast, **multi-polar systems** have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics **result**ing **in frequent crises and major wars** among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars.¶ American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, **regional powers could rearm** in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, **there would be** a heightened possibility of **arms races, miscalculation, or** other crises spiraling into **all-out conflict**. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.¶ As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, **the U**nited **S**tates **is the most significant barrier facing Chinese** hegemony and **aggression.**

## Warming Impact

Immigration reform is key to innovation. **McGraw 12** writes[[31]](#footnote-31)

SOME 70 million immigrants have come to America since the first colonists arrived. The role their labor has played in economic development is widely understood. Much less familiar is the extent to which their remarkable innovations have driven American prosperity. Indeed, while both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney have lauded entrepreneurship, innovation and “job creation,” neither candidate has made comprehensive immigration reform an issue, despite immigrants’ crucial role in those fields. Yet understanding how **immigrants have fueled innovation through history** is critical to making sure they continue to drive prosperity in the future. At the country’s beginning, the three most important architects of its financial system were immigrants: Alexander Hamilton, from St. Croix, then part of the Danish West Indies; Robert Morris, born in Liverpool, England; and Albert Gallatin of Geneva. Morris was superintendent of finance during the Revolutionary War, using every resource at his command to support the army in the field. Hamilton, as the first secretary of the Treasury, rescued the country from bankruptcy and designed its basic financial system. Gallatin paid down much of the national debt, engineered the financing of the Louisiana Purchase and remains the longest-serving Treasury secretary ever. Immigrants’ financial innovations continued through the 19th century. In 1808 Alexander Brown, from Ireland, founded the nation’s first investment bank, and his immigrant sons set up Brown Brothers. The Lehman brothers, from Germany, began as dry-goods merchants and cotton brokers in Alabama, then moved to New York just before the Civil War and eventually founded a bank. Many other immigrants, including Marcus Goldman of Goldman Sachs, followed similar paths, starting very small, traveling to new cities and establishing banks. Meanwhile, “Yankee” firms like Kidder, Peabody and Drexel, Morgan — whose partners were native-born — remained less mobile, tied by family and high society to Boston and New York. Immigrant innovators were pioneers in many other industries after the Civil War. Three examples were Andrew Carnegie (Scotland, steel), Joseph Pulitzer (Hungary, newspapers) and David Sarnoff (Russia, electronics). Each came to America young, poor and full of energy. Carnegie’s mother brought the family to Pittsburgh in 1848, when Andrew was 12. He became a bobbin-boy in a textile mill, a telegram messenger, a telegraph-key operator, a low-level manager at the Pennsylvania Railroad, a division superintendent for the same railroad and a bond salesman for the railroad in Europe. Recognizing the limitless market for the rails that carried trains, Carnegie jumped to steel. His most important innovation was “hard driving” blast furnaces, wearing them out quickly. This violated the accepted practice of “coddling” furnaces, but he calculated that his vastly increased output cut the price of steel far more than replacing the furnaces cost his company. In turn, an immense quantity of cheap steel found its way into lucrative new uses: structural steel for skyscrapers, sheet steel for automobiles. Pulitzer was the home-tutored son of a prosperous Hungarian family that lost its fortune. He came to the United States in 1864 at age 17, recruited by a Massachusetts Civil War regiment. Penniless after the war ended, he went to St. Louis, a center for German immigrants, whose language he spoke fluently. He worked as a waiter, a railroad clerk, a lawyer and a reporter for a local German newspaper, part of which he eventually purchased. In 1879, he acquired two English-language papers and merged them into The St. Louis Post-Dispatch. In 1883, he moved to New York, where he bought The New York World and began a fierce competition with other New York papers, mainly the Sun and, later, William Randolph Hearst’s New York Journal. The New York World was pro-labor, pro-immigration and, remarkably, both serious and sensationalist. It achieved a huge circulation. Sarnoff was just 9 years old when he arrived from Russia in 1901. He earned money selling Yiddish newspapers on the street and singing at a synagogue, and then worked as an office clerk, a messenger and, like Carnegie, a telegraph operator. From there he became part of the fledgling radio firm RCA and rose rapidly within its ranks. Sarnoff was among the first to see radio’s potential as “point-to-mass” entertainment, i.e., broadcasting. He devoted a huge percentage of profits to research and development, and won an epic battle with CBS over industry standards for color TV. For decades, RCA and electronics were practically synonymous. As these men show, **one** of the **key trait**s **of** immigrant **innovators is geographic mobility**, both from the home country and within the United States. Consider the striking roster of 20th-century immigrants who led the development of fields like movies and information technology: the Hollywood studios MGM, Warner Brothers, United Artists, Paramount and Universal; the Silicon Valley companies Intel, eBay, Google, Yahoo and Sun Microsystems. The economist Joseph Schumpeter — yet another immigrant, and the most perceptive early analyst of innovation — considered it to be the fundamental component of entrepreneurship: “The typical entrepreneur is more self-centered than other types, because he relies less than they do on tradition and connection” and because his efforts consist “precisely in breaking up old, and creating new, tradition.” For that reason, innovators always encounter resistance from people whose economic and social interests are threatened by new products and methods. Compared with the native-born, who have extended families and lifelong social and commercial relationships, **immigrants without** such ties — without businesses to inherit or **family property to protect — are** in some ways **better prepared to play** the **innovator**’s role. A hundred academic monographs could not prove that immigrants are more innovative than native-born Americans, because each spurs the other on. Innovations by the blended population were, and still are, integral to the economic growth of the United States. **But our** overly complex **immigration law hampers** even the most obvious **innovators**’ efforts to become citizens. **It endangers our tradition of entrepreneurship**, and it must be repaired — soon.

Innovation solves warming. **Norris and Jenkins 9** write[[32]](#footnote-32)

Whatever the cause, we have very little chance of overcoming climate change without enlisting young **innovators** at a drastically greater scale. Simply put, they **represent** one of **the most important catalyst**s **for** creating **a clean energy economy** and achieving long-term prosperity. The reason is this: at its core, **climate change is a challenge of** technology **innovation.** Over **the next four decades,** **global energy demand will** approximately **double**. Most of this growth will happen in developing nations as they continue lifting their citizens out of poverty and building modern societies. **But** over the same period, global greenhouse gas **emissions must fall dramatically** to avert the worst consequences of climate change. Shortly before his untimely death in 2005, the Nobel Prize-winning physicist Richard Smalley coined this the "Terawatt Challenge": increasing global energy production from roughly 15 terawatts in 2005 to 60 terawatts annually by 2100 in a way that simultaneously confronts the challenges of global warming, poverty alleviation, and resource depletion. The single greatest obstacle to meeting the Terawatt Challenge is the "technology gap" between dirty and clean energy sources. Low-carbon energy technologies remain significantly more expensive than fossil fuels. For example, solar photovoltaic electricity costs up to three to five times that of coal electricity, and plug-in hybrid and electric vehicles can be twice as expensive as their gasoline-fueled competitors. **Unless** this technology gap is bridged and **clean** energy **tech**nologies **become affordable** and scalable, **poor and rich nations alike will continue opposing** significant **prices on** their carbon **emissions and** will continue **rely**ing primarily up**on** coal and other **fossil fuels** to power their development. **This will** virtually **assure massive climate destabilization.** So the task is clear: **to avoid climate catastrophe** and create a new energy economy, we must unleash our forces of innovation - namely, scientists, engineers and entrepreneurs- to invent a new portfolio of truly scalable clean energy technologies, chart new paths to bring these technologies to market, and ensure they are affordable enough to deploy throughout the world.

Ocean studies prove warming causes extinction. **Sify 10** writes[[33]](#footnote-33)

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of **greenhouse gases are driving irreversible** and dramatic **change**s **in** the way the **oceans** function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. **The findings** of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' **emerged from a synthesis of recent research** on the world's oceans, carried out **by two of the world's leading marine scientists**. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is **further evidence that we are well on the way to** the next great **extinction** event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly **if the trend continues.** The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added.

## Economy Impact

CIR key to the economy. **India Times 4-27** writes[[34]](#footnote-34)

WASHINGTON: Key authors of the **c**omprehensive US **i**mmigration **r**eform bill reached out to the American businesses on their path-breaking legislative venture, saying that the bill **addresses** their concerns on **skill shortage and would boost** the country's **economic growth.** Listing out the key-business friendly provisions of the immigration bill, the Senators told the corporate sector that this not only increases the number of H-1B visas, but also retains and attracts talents from across the world, which the US needs the most. Addressing members of the powerful US Chambers of Commerce, Senator John McCain urged the business community to lobby and support the bill, which was introduced in the US Senate by the bipartisan group of eight Senator dubbed as the Gang of Eight, of which he is a key member. "**High tech companies will** be able to **bring in and keep more highly skilled workers through the** H-1B **visa program.** The bill would raise the cap on H-1Bs to 110,000 a year with an absolute ceiling of 180,000. American workers will always be given the first opportunity for a job," McCain said. Under the new bill, he said, **if a student graduates** from a US college **with a s**cience **t**echnology **e**ngineering **m**ath **degree** and have an offer of employment **that would** be eligible to **receive a green card** to stay in this country. "I'm sure you are aware that **over half of the students in the USA**, that are **receiving advanced degrees**, **are not citizens** of the USA. If they want to stay in this country and they have a job, then we should be able to accommodate for that, **it's obviously important for our economy," the top Republican Senator said.**

Economic crisis causes nuclear war–strong statistical support. **Royal 10**[[35]](#footnote-35)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances **Modelski and Thompson**’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **find**ing **that** rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises could **usher in a redistribution of** relative **power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing** the risk of **miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as **a rising power may** seek to **challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if** the **expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for **conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic **decline has also been linked with** an increase in the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, **crises** generally **reduce the popularity of a sitting government.** “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting **governments** have increased incentives to **fabricate** external military **conflict**s **to create a “rally around the flag” effect.** Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force.

## Latin Relations Impact

Immigration reform is key to Latin American relations which solve multiple existential risks. Now is key. **Shifter 12** writes[[36]](#footnote-36)

**Some** enduring **problems stand** squarely **in the way of** partnership and **effective cooperation.** The **inability** of Washington **to reform** its broken **immigration** system **is a constant source of friction between the U**nited **S**tates **and** nearly **every other country in the Americas**. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations. Another chronic irritant is US drug policy, which most Latin Americans now believe makes their drug and crime problems worse. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, while visiting Mexico, acknowledged that US anti-drug programs have not worked. Yet, despite growing calls and pressure from the region, the United States has shown little interest in exploring alternative approaches. Similarly, Washington’s more than half-century embargo on Cuba, as well as other elements of United States’ Cuba policy, is strongly opposed by all other countries in the hemisphere. Indeed, the US position on these troublesome issues—immigration, drug policy, and Cuba—has set Washington against the consensus view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments. These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas . The United States and the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships. **There are compelling reasons for the U**nited **S**tates **and Latin America to pursue** more **robust ties. Every country** in the Americas **would benefit** from strengthened and expanded economic relations, **with improved access to** each other’s **markets**, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, **the U**nited **S**tates’ **$16-trillion economy is** a **vital** market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology **for Latin America**, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will** inevitably **become** more and more **crucial to the U**nited **S**tates’ **economic future. The U**nited **S**tates and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean **would** also **gain** a great deal **by more cooperation on** such **global matters as climate change**, nuclear **non-prolif**eration, and **democracy and human rights.** With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . **If new opportunities are not seized, relations** will likely **continue to drift apart** . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric **affairs require urgent attention**—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

## India Relations Impact

CIR is key to India relations. **LA Times 12** writes[[37]](#footnote-37)

"**C**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform **will see expansion of skilled labor visas**," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, **Lowell** said he **expects to see at least a fivefold increase in** the number of highly **skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India** and China." **There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries** and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like **India** and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still **see the immigration opportunity as a** bigger **plus** than not," he said.

US-India relations are key to avoid nuclear war. **Schaffer 2** writes[[38]](#footnote-38)

**Washington**'s increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they **can benefit by closer cooperation**. For Washington, **the advantages include** a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as **a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade** and investment **benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India**. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

***Optional:***

US India relations solve every major existential risk. **Burns 05**[[39]](#footnote-39)

A strong democratic India is an important partner for the United States. We anticipate that **India will play an** increasingly **important leadership role in 21st century Asia, working with us to promote democracy, economic growth, stability and peace** in that vital region. By cooperating with India now, we accelerate the arrival of the benefits that India's rise brings to the region and the world. By fostering ever-closer bilateral ties, we also eliminate any possibility that our two nations might overlook their natural affinities and enter into another period of unproductive estrangement, as was so often the case in the past half century. Today, for the first time since bilateral relations were established in 1947, the United States and India are bound together by a strong congruence of interests, values, and a large and successful Indian-American community. Consequently we find an especially receptive partner in New Delhi, one no longer bound by Cold War politics or dogma. The **India**n Government **has demonstrated its firm desire to enhance our bilateral relationship. The United States now has a window of opportunity** to seize the initiative with India, **to build bonds** and habits **of cooperation that will stand the test of time. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to** undertake ambitious actions that **correct our mutual history with India** of missed opportunities **and advance our common interests in the century ahead. We seek to work with India to win the** global **War on Terror**ism**, prevent the spread of w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction, **enhance peace and stability in Asia, protect trade routes and sea lines of communication, and** advance the **spread** of **democracy. India and the United States now find ourselves on the same side on all of these critical** strategic **objectives.** Our challenge, then, is to translate our converging interests into shared goals and compatible strategies designed to achieve those aims. In this context, the wide range of initiatives agreed to by President Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh this July, including our agreement to promote civilian nuclear energy cooperation, represents a unique chance to build trust between the United States and India because of the resonance all these programs have for both countries.

Indo Pak war outweighs. Studies prove it causes extinction.

**Robock and Toon 9** write[[40]](#footnote-40)

Twenty-five years ago international teams of scientists showed that a nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union could produce a “nuclear winter.” The smoke from vast fires started by bombs dropped on cit­ies and industrial areas would envelop the planet and absorb so much sunlight that the earth’s sur­face would get cold, dark and dry, killing plants worldwide and eliminating our food supply. Sur­face temperatures would reach winter values in the summer. International discussion about this prediction, fueled largely by astronomer Carl Sa­gan, forced the leaders of the two superpowers to confront the possibility that their arms race endangered not just themselves but the entire hu­man race. Countries large and small demanded disarmament. Nuclear winter became an important factor in ending the nuclear arms race. Looking back later, in 2000, former Soviet Union leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev observed, “Models made by Russian and American scientists showed that a **nuclear war** would result in a nuclear winter that **would be extremely destructive to all life on earth**; the knowledge of that was a great stimulus to us, to people of honor and mo­rality, to act.” Why discuss this topic now that the cold war has ended? Because as other nations continue to acquire nuclear weapons, smaller, **regional nu­clear wars could create a** similar **global catastro­phe**. New analyses reveal that a **conflict be­tween India and Pakistan**, for example, **in which 100 nuclear bombs were dropped** on cities and industrial areas—only 0.4 percent of the world’s more than 25,000 warheads—**would produce enough smoke to cripple global agriculture**. A **regional war could cause widespread loss of life even in countries far away** from the conflict.

And, relations are key to accessing every impact

**Asia Society Task Force 9** writes[[41]](#footnote-41)

**India matters to** virtually **every major** foreign policy **issue** that will confront the United States in the years ahead. **A** broad-based, **close relationship with India will** thus **be necessary to solve complex global challenges, achieve security in** the critical **South Asia**n region, **reestablish stability in the global economy, and overcome** the threat of **violent Islamic radicalism** which has taken root across the region and in India. The members of this task force believe that the US relationship with India will be among our most important in the future, and will at long last reach its potential for global impact—provided that strong leadership on both sides steers the way. The new relationship rests on a convergence of US and Indian national interests, and never in our history have they been so closely aligned. **With India, we can** harness our principles and power together to **focus on** the urgent interconnected challenges of our shared future: economic stability, expanded **trade, the environment and climate change, innovation, nonproliferation, public health, sustainability, and terrorism**. **Together our two countries will** be able to **take on** some of **the most vexing problems facing the world** today, and improve the lives and security of our citizens in doing so. But to get there, we must set broad yet realistic goals to be shared by both countries.

## China Relations Impact

CIR is key to China relations. **LA Times 12** writes[[42]](#footnote-42)

"**C**omprehensive **i**mmigration **r**eform **will see expansion of skilled labor visas**," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, **Lowell** said he **expects to see at least a fivefold increase in** the number of highly **skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for** India and **China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries** and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and **China** weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still **see the immigration opportunity as a** bigger **plus** than not," he said.

US China relations solve multiple extinction scenarios. **Desperes 1** writes[[43]](#footnote-43)

Nevertheless, America's main interests in China have been quite constant, namely peace, security, prosperity, and a healthy environment. Chinese interests in the United States have also been quite constant and largely compatible, notwithstanding sharp differences over Taiwan, strategic technology transfers, trade, and human rights. Indeed, U.S.-Chinese relations have been consistently driven by strong common interests in preventing mutually damaging wars in Asia that could involve nuclear weapons; in ensuring that Taiwan's relations with the mainland remain peaceful; in sustaining the growth of the U.S., China, and other Asian-Pacific economies; and, in preserving natural environments that sustain healthy and productive lives. What happens in China matters to Americans. It affects America's prosperity. **China's growing economy is a valuable market to many workers, farmers, and businesses across America**, not just to large multinational firms like Boeing, Microsoft, and Motorola, **and it could become much more valuable by opening its markets further. China** also affects America's security. It **could** either help to **stabilize** or destabilize currently peaceful but sometimes tense and **dangerous situations in Korea**, where U.S. troops are on the front line; **in the Taiwan Straits,** where U.S. democratic values and strategic credibility may be at stake; **and in nuclear-armed South Asia**, where renewed warfare could lead to terrible consequences. It also affects America's environment. Indeed, **how China meets** its rising **energy needs** and protects its dwindling habitats **will affect the global atmosphere** and currently endangered species.

## Cyber-Security Impact

Immigration reform is key to cybersecurity. **McLarty 9** writes[[44]](#footnote-44)

We have seen, when you look at the table of **the top 20 firms that are** H1-B **visa requestors**, at least 15 of those **are IT firms.** And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States.¶ **We're seeing** a lot more **activity around cyber-security**, certainly noteworthy attacks here very **recently.** It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to generate a more effective group of **IT experts** here in the United States, many of which **are coming** to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions **from overseas and** often **returning back**? **This** potentially **puts us at a** competitive **disadvantage** going forward.¶ MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more **talented students** studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really **have** a **tremendous ability to develop** these kind of **tech**nology and scientific advances, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of **the green card** being **handed to them** or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, **that's going to strengthen**, I think, our system, our **security needs**.

Cyberterror causes nuclear war. **Fritz 09** writes[[45]](#footnote-45)

This paper will analyse the threat of cyber terrorism in regard to nuclear weapons. Specifically, this research will use open source knowledge to identify the structure of nuclear command and control centres, how those structures might be compromised through computer network operations, and how doing so would fit within established **cyber terrorists**’ capabilities, strategies, and tactics. If access to command and control centres is obtained, terrorists **could fake or actually cause one nuclear**-armed **state to attack another**, thus provoking a nuclear response from another nuclear power. This may be an easier alternative for terrorist groups than building or acquiring a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb themselves. […] [Full Text Available] Efforts by militaries to place **increasing reliance on computer networks**, including experimental technology such as autonomous systems, **and** their desire to have **multiple launch options**, such as nuclear triad capability, **enables multiple entry points for terrorists**. For example, if a terrestrial command centre is impenetrable, perhaps isolating one nuclear armed submarine would prove an easier task. There is evidence to suggest multiple attempts have been made by hackers to compromise the extremely low radio frequency once used by the US Navy to send nuclear launch approval to submerged submarines. Additionally, **the** alleged **Soviet system** known as Perimetr was designed **to automatically launch nuclear weapons** if it was unable to establish communications with Soviet leadership. This was intended as a retaliatory response in the event that nuclear weapons had decapitated Soviet leadership; however it **did not account for the possibility of cyber terrorists blocking communications** through computer network operations in an attempt to engage the system. Should a warhead be launched, damage could be further enhanced through additional computer network operations. By using proxies, multi-layered attacks could be engineered. Terrorists could remotely commandeer computers in China and use them to launch a US nuclear attack against Russia. Thus Russia would believe it was under attack from the US and the US would believe China was responsible. Further, emergency response communications could be disrupted, transportation could be shut down, and disinformation, such as misdirection, could be planted, thereby hindering the disaster relief effort and maximizing destruction. **Disruptions in communication and** the use of **disinformation could also** be used to **provoke uninformed responses.** For example, a nuclear strike between India and Pakistan could be coordinated with Distributed Denial of Service attacks against key networks, so they would have further difficulty in identifying what happened and be forced to respond quickly. Terrorists could also knock out communications between these states so they cannot discuss the situation. Alternatively, amidst the confusion of a traditional large-scale terrorist attack, **claims of responsibility** and declarations of war **could be falsified** in an attempt to instigate a hasty military response. These false claims could be posted directly on Presidential, military, and government websites. E-mails could also be sent to the media and foreign governments using the IP addresses and e-mail accounts of government officials. A sophisticated and all encompassing combination of traditional terrorism and **cyber terrorism could be enough to launch nuclear weapons on its own**, without the need for compromising command and control centres directly.

## Racism Impact

Immigration reform solves racism. Now is key. **Blumenfield 2/1**[[46]](#footnote-46)

Like the noble words from Emma Lazarus's sonnet "The New Colossus" engraved on a bronze plague affixed to the pedestal of the Statue of Liberty, these sentiments express a foundational tenet on which the United States itself stands. In direct contradiction to these sentiments, however, immigration policy has not lived up to these guiding principles, based instead onessentialist and stereotypical notions of race, ethnicity, and religion.¶ In the current national debates over immigration reform, in its Jan. 30, 2013 editorial, for example, the conservative National Review referred to "Hispanics" as "hostile" to "free enterprise," and "[t]hey are disproportionately low-income and disproportionately likely to receive some form of government support. More than half of Hispanic births are out of wedlock."¶ These **racial**ly- and ethnically-charged **representations** of minoritized people **perpetuate a**long and dishonorable **tradition of preventing "**the **huddled masses to breathe free."**¶ We need to keep in mind that the notion of "race" is socially constructed. The concept of "race" arose concurrently with the advent of European exploration as a justification and rationale for conquest and domination of the globe beginning around the 15th century of the Common Era. Though "race" is a human-imposed invention, however, its implications have far reaching consequences impacting individuals and groups in profound ways.¶ While given the option of living in peaceful co-existence, European invaders stepped upon this land guided by the conviction that Providence destined them to expand from Atlantic to Pacific (from "sea to shining sea") led by the so-called Anglo-Saxon "race." This they used as justification in their unquenchable thirst for land ultimately resulting in their forced removal and physical and cultural genocide of indigenous peoples, and an unjustified imperialist-inspired war with Mexico.¶ "This continent," a congressman declared, "was intended by Providence as a vast theatre on which to work out the grand experiment of Republican government, under the auspices of the Anglo-Saxon race" (quoted in Takaki, 1993, p. 176).¶ The Puritans fled England for the "New World" to practice their "purer" form of Christianity, believing God had chosen them to form "a biblical commonwealth," which would not tolerate any separation of "church and state," or, indeed, any religious beliefs outside their own.¶ The newly constituted United States **Congress passed the Naturalization Act in 1790 excluding** all **nonwhites from citizenship**, including Asians, enslaved Africans, and American Indians, the later whom they defined in oxymoronic terms as "domestic foreigners," even though they had inhabited this land for an estimated 35,000 years. The Congress refused to grant American Indians rights of citizenship until 1924 with the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act, though it continued to deny Asians naturalized citizenship status.¶ Protestant American "Nativist" prejudices against Irish Catholics escalated in the mid-1850s when the so-called "Know Nothing" movement attempted to prevent Catholics from ascending to public office. After 1860, Irish were met with "HELP WANTED: IRISH NEED NOT APPLY" signs hanging in store windows.¶Congress passed the first law specifically restricting or excluding immigrants on the basis of "race" and nationality in 1882. **Attempting to eliminate** entry of Chinese (and other **Asian**) **workers who** often **competed** for jobs **with U.S. citizens,** especially in the western United States, **Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act** to constrict their entry into the U.S. for a 10-year period, while denying citizenship to Chinese people already on these shores. The Act also made it illegal for Chinese people to marry white or black Americans.¶ The editor of a newspaper in Butte, Mt., summarized the exclusionist sentiment regarding the Chinese held by many U.S. citizens: "The Chinaman's life is not our life, his religion is not our religion....He belongs not in Butte" (Swartout, 1992, p. 78).¶ The Immigration Act of 1917 further prohibited immigration from Asian countries, in the terms of the law, the "barred zone," including parts of China, India, present-day Thailand, Burma, Asiatic Russian, the Polynesian Islands, and parts of Afghanistan.¶ Fearing a continued influx of immigrants, legislators in the U.S. Congress in 1924 enacted an anti-immigration law (Origins Quota Act, or National Origins Act) setting restrictive quotas of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, specifically Poles, Italians, Greeks, and Slaves (so-called "PIGS" groups viewed as representing Europe's lower "races"), including Jews (the later referred to as members of the so-called "Hebrew race," considered the lowest of all the European "races"). The law, however, permitted large allocations of immigrants from Great Britain and Germany.¶ In addition, the law included a clause prohibiting entry of "aliens ineligible to citizenship," which was veiled language referring to Japanese and other Asians dating back to the Naturalization Act of 1790 restricting citizenship to only "white" people and affirmed by a 1922 U. S. Supreme Court ruling (Takao Ozawa v. United States) in which the government denied Takao Ozawa, a Japanese immigrant, the right to become a naturalized citizen because he "clearly" was "not Caucasian."¶ Congress, in 1939, refused to pass an emergency measure, the Wagner-Rogers Act, which would have permitted entry of 20,000 children, primarily Jewish, from Eastern Europe over existing quotas. According to Laura Delano Houghteling, cousin of FDR and wife of the U.S. commissioner of immigration, who spoke out against the proposed legislation: "20,000 charming children would, all too soon, grow into 20,000 ugly adults."¶The 1952 McCarran-Walters Act overturned the 1924 law. Later, framed as an amendment to McCarran-Walters, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 removed "natural origins" as the basis for U.S. immigration. The 1965 law increased immigration from Asian and Latin American countries and religious backgrounds.¶ Horace Kallen, a Jewish immigrant and sociologist of Polish and Latvian heritage coined the term "cultural pluralism" to challenge the image of the so-called "melting pot," which he considered inherently undemocratic. Kallen envisioned a United States in the image of a great symphony orchestra, not sounding in unison (the "melting pot"), but rather, one in which all the disparate cultures play in harmony and retain their unique and distinctive tones and timbres.¶ Returning to today, if we learn anything from our immigration legislative history, **we can** view the current debates as providing a great opportunity to **pass comprehensive** federal **reform based not on "race**,**"** nationality, ethnicity, religion, or other social identity categories, **but** rather, on humane principles of fairness, **compassion, and equity. We have a** wonderful **chance now to avoid the mistakes of the past** and finally to "lift [the] lamp beside the golden door!"

Our racist culture must be challenged to prevent extinction. **Barndt 91**[[47]](#footnote-47)

To study racism is to study walls. We have looked at barriers and fences and limitations, ghettos and prisons. The prison of racism confines us all, people of color and white people alike. It shackles the victimizer as well as the victim. The walls forcibly keep people of color and white people separate from each other; in our separate prisons we are all prevented from achieving the human potential that God intends for us. The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust; **the effects of uncontrolled power**, **[and] privilege**, and greed, **which are the marks of our white prison will inevitably destroy us as well.** But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. **We are not condemned to an inexorable fate**, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. **Brick by brick, stone by stone,** the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural **racism can be destroyed.** You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger of self-destruction seems to be drawing ever more near. **The result**s **of centuries of** national and **worldwide conquest and colonization,** of **military buildups and violent aggression,** of overconsumption **and environmental destruction may** be **reach**ing **the point of no return.** **A small** and predominantly **white minority** of global population **derives its power** and privilege **from suffering**s **of** the vast majority of **peoples of color.** **For the sake of the world** and ourselves, **we dare not allow it to continue.**

## Air Force Impact

Immigration is key to air power. **AIAA 10** writes[[48]](#footnote-48)

Without a strong aerospace workforce, the United States will lose the resulting economic and national security benefits. Incentives are needed for industry to invest in domestic aerospace workforce development, and for U.S. students to choose an engineering career. **Barriers to employing** talented **foreign nationals must** also **be removed**. Aerospace represents about $200 billion (or 1.5%) of the domestic economy and in 1997 provided a $56 billion positive trade balance. The aerospace workforce is the foundation of the industry’s success, yet unique workforce demographics present challenges. Figure 11 shows the age distribution of the aerospace business workforce compared to the total U.S. workforce. Up to **half of the current** aerospace **workforce will be eligible for retirement within five years**. Aerospace workforce composition does not match national demographic averages. Compared to the total US workforce, the aerospace industry and NASA have a disproportionately large percentage of workers aged 4055, and a disproportionately small percentage of workers younger than 40. Student loans, research dollars to support universities, and service scholarships can provide incentives for younger workers to consider aerospace and join the industry. If talented young engineers are not recruited, retained, and developed to replace the workforce generation that is near retirement, then the U.S. stands to lose the valuable economic and critical national security benefits of the domestic aerospace industry. As shown in Figure 22, large percentages of engineers are working outside the science and engineering professions. Engineering students burdened with college loans are seeking greener pastures. As shown in Figure 33, aerospace engineering salaries are low compared to other industries. If the U.S. is to retain its edge in this industry, salaries need to rise and incentives given for entering the industry. Further, since 1980, the number of nonacademic science and engineering jobs has grown at more than four times the rate of the U.S. labor force as a whole2. With a growing number of science and engineering jobs anticipated, **the supply of visas** set aside under law for “highly qualified foreign workers,” – 65,000 a year4 – **is not enough**. A decline in student, exchange, and temporary high-skilled worker visas issued since 2001 interrupted a long-term trend of growth. The number of student visas and of temporary high-skilled worker visas issued have both declined by more than 25% since FY 2001. These declines were due both to fewer applications and to an increase in the proportion of visa applications rejected2.**To add to the supply pressures** of science and engineering workers in our economy, **there is increased recruitment of high-skilled labor**, including scientists and engineers, **by** many national **governments** and private firms. For example, in 1999, 241,000 individuals entered Japan with temporary high-skill work visas, a 75 percent increase over 19925. **R**esearch **and d**evelopment expenditures **keep the aerospace industry strong and** help **maintain US leadership** in this sector. As shown in Figure 46, the R&D tax credit is working to increase corporate spending on this important activity. In the early 1990s, after implementation of the R&D tax credit legislation, private expenditures on R&D rose2. Yet even with this incentive, U.S. industry research and development funding is lagging. In 2001, US industry spent more on tort litigation than on research and development4. Perhaps as a result, American companies are lagging in patents. In 2005, only four American companies ranked among the top 10 corporate recipients of patents granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office4. And to further add to this distressing R&D dollars situation, federal research funding is lagging as well. The amount invested annually by the US federal government in research in the physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering combined is less than what Americans spend on potato chips7,8. RECOMMENDATIONS To remain globally competitive, **the U.S. must** adopt policies to **increase our talent base in** science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (**STEM**), must educate, engage, and retain STEM professionals using means consistent with generational changes in technologies and markets, and must provide incentives for investment in research and development that helps to attract applicable talent. The AIAA recommends policies in three areas to achieve these goals: incentives for college students to study engineering, and corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, and immigration for STEM professionals. In the area of incentives for college students to study engineering, forgivable loan programs should be implemented for students who study engineering and enter the domestic technical workforce. Service scholarships should be created to pay college for students who desire to and will serve in aerospace-related U.S. government agencies after graduation. In addition, investments must be made in aerospace research infrastructure and increasing R&D funding to universities, since good research opportunities attract talented students into graduate STEM studies. R&D dollars provide a fourfold return by supporting graduate students, generating knowledge, creating innovation opportunities for small businesses around universities, and building the next generation of talented engineers. In the area of corporate incentives for investing in the aerospace workforce, targeted tax credits or incentives should be instituted for domestic aerospace workforce development expenses. An IR&D-like program for aerospace workforce development should be established by allowing a small percentage of government contract funding to aerospace companies to go into a development fund to be used on effective programs to expand domestic workforce capabilities. In addition, the R&D tax credit should be made permanent, providing stability to corporate fiscal policies, and thereby fostering a critical technology and engineering research environment that attracts the best and brightest into the technology and engineering fields. Lastly, in the area of immigration, barriers should be removed so that the US may retain talented foreign nationals in STEM professions critical to the aerospace industry.

Aerospace Air and space power are key to deter WMD conflict in Asia.

**Khalilzad and Lesser 98** write[[49]](#footnote-49)

The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that **American air and space power will** continue to **remain critical for** conventional and unconventional **deterrence in Asia**. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response **because (a)** of the vast **distance**s on the Asian continent; **(b)** the **diverse** range of operational **platforms** available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; **(c)** the possible **unavailability of naval assets** in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; **and (d)** the **heavy payload** that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The **Korea**n peninsula, **China, and** the **India**n subcontinent **are already arenas of** WMD **prolif**eration. While emergent **nuclear** capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, **chemical and bio**logical warfare **threats will** progressively **become future problems.** The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

The second key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that **air and space power will function as a vital rapid reaction force** in a breaking crisis. Current guidance tasks the Air Force to prepare for two major regional conflicts that could break out in the Persian Gulf and on the Korean peninsula. In other areas of Asia, however, such as the Indian subcontinent, the South China Sea, Southeast Asia, and Myanmar, the United States has no treaty obligations requiring it to commit the use of its military forces. But as past experience has shown, American policymakers have regularly displayed the disconcerting habit of discovering strategic interests in parts of the world previously neglected after conflicts have already broken out. Mindful of this trend, it would behoove U.S. Air Force planners to prudently plan for regional contingencies in nontraditional areas of interest, because naval and air power will of necessity be the primary instruments constituting the American response. Such responses would be necessitated by three general classes of contingencies. The first involves the politico-military collapse of a key regional actor, as might occur in the case of North Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, or Pakistan. The second involves acute politicalmilitary crises that have a potential for **rapid escalation**, as **may occur in** the **Taiwan** Strait, **the Spratlys,** the **India**n subcontinent, **or** on the **Korea**n peninsula. The third involves cases of prolonged **domestic instability** that **may** have either **spillover** or contagion effects, as **in China, Indonesia, Myanmar, or North Korea.** In each of these cases, U.S. responses may vary from simply being a concerned onlooker to prosecuting the whole range of military operations to providing post-conflict assistance in a permissive environment. Depending on the political choices made, Air Force contributions would obviously vary. If the first response is selected, contributions would consist predominantly of vital, specialized, airbreathing platforms such as AWACS, JSTARS, and Rivet Joint—in tandem with controlled space assets—that would be necessary for assessment of political crises erupting in the region. The second response, in contrast, would burden the entire range of U.S. Air Force capabilities, in the manner witnessed in Operation Desert Storm. The third response, like the first, would call for specialized capabilities, mostly in the areas of strategic lift and airborne tanker support. The third key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that despite increasing regional air capabilities, U.S. Air Force assets will be required to fill gaps in critical warfighting areas. The capabilities of the Asian states, including those of U.S. allies and neutral states, have been steadily increasing in the last two decades. These increases have occurred largely through the acquisition of late-generation, advanced combat aircraft such as the MiG-29, and the F-15, F-16, and F/A-18 together with short-range infrared and medium-range semi-active air-to-air missiles. Despite such acquisitions, however, the states that possess these aircraft have not become truly effective users of air power, in part because acquiring advanced combat aircraft and their associated technologies is a small part of ensuring overall proficiency in the exploitation of air power. The latter includes incorporating effective training regimes, maintaining large and diverse logistics networks, developing an indigenous industrial infrastructure capable of supporting the variegated air assets, and integrating specific subspecialties such as air-to-air refueling, electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, airspace surveillance and battle management capabilities in a hostile environment, and night and adverse weather operations. Most of the Asian air forces lack full air-power capabilities of the sort described above. The Japanese and South Korean air forces are, as a rule, optimized mostly for air defense operations. Both air forces are generally proficient in all-weather defensive counterair operations, and they possess relatively modest day ground-attack capabilities as well. Because of their specific operating environments, however, the Japanese air force is particularly proficient in maritime air operations, whereas the South Korean air force has some close air support (CAS) experience as well. The Chinese air force (People’s Liberation Army Air Force, [PLAAF]) is still a predominantly daylight defensive counterair force with limited daylight attack capabilities, as are most of the Southeast Asian air forces, but the PLAAF has recently demonstrated an impressive ability to integrate its new weapon systems (e.g., the Su-27) much faster than most observers expected. The air forces of the Indian subcontinent have somewhat greater capabilities. Most squadrons of the Indian and Pakistani air forces are capable of daylight defensive counterair, a few are capable of all-weather defensive counterair, and several Indian units are capable of battlefield air interdiction and deep penetration-interdiction strike. None of these air forces, however, is particularly proficient at night and all-weather ground attack, especially at operational ranges. They lack advanced munitions, especially in the air-to-surface regime. With the exception of Japan and Singapore, they lack battle management command, control and communications (BMC3 ) platforms as well as the logistics and training levels required for successful, extended, high-tempo operations. **The brittle quality of Asian air forces implies that U.S. Air Force** assets **will be required** to fill critical gaps in allied air capabilities as well as to counter both the growing capabilities of potential adversaries such as China and the new nontraditional threats emerging in the form of ballistic and cruise missiles, information warfare, WMD, and possibly even the revolution in military affairs. The fourth key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that there will be increasing political constraints on en-route and in-theater access. Problems of basing for en-route and in-theater access will become of concern as the Asian states grow in confidence and capability. For the moment, however, such problems have been held in check because of the continuing threats on the Korean peninsula and recent revitalization of the U.S.-Japanese security treaty. But these developments constitute only a reprieve, not an enduring solution. The availability of the Korean bases after unification is an open question. Even if these and the Japanese bases continue to be available, their use will be increasingly restricted by the host countries for routine training operations and especially for nontraditional out-of-area operations. The recent difficulties caused by the refusal of the Gulf states to permit U.S. air operations against Saddam Hussein will become the norm in the Asia-Pacific region as well. There are already some indicators to this effect. For example, constitutional and legal restraints in the form of Article 9 could prevent Japan from providing access, logistical support, and reinforcements in the context of crises in Asia. There is also relatively weak political support for all but the most narrow range of contingencies, as became evident in Japanese, Korean, and Southeast Asian reluctance to support U.S. gunboat diplomacy during the recent (1995–1996) China-Taiwan face-off. Even the Southeast states, which benefit most from U.S. presence and deterrent capabilities in the region, were conspicuously silent—and in some cases even undercut American efforts at restraining Chinese intimidation of Taiwan. Besides these growing political constraints, the fact remains that in some feasible contingencies the U.S. Air Force will have little or no access whatsoever to some regions in Asia. The absence of air bases in Southeast Asia and the northern Indian Ocean, for example, could threaten the execution of contingency plans involving either South Asia or Myanmar. The vast distances in the Asia-Pacific region could come to haunt Air Force operations, because existing facilities at Diego Garcia and in the Persian Gulf are too far away for any but the most minimal operations. Increasing political constrictions coupled with the sparse number of operating facilities available imply that even such potentially innovative U.S. Air Force solutions as the “air expeditionary force” and “composite air wings” could run into show-stopping impediments beyond U.S. Air Force control. This, in turn, has four consequences. First, American policymakers should investigate the possibility of securing additional air base access in Asia. The most attractive candidate, especially in the context of a rising China, is Cam Ran Bay in Vietnam. Other alternatives, especially for contingencies in the Persian Gulf and the greater South Asian region, could include transit rights in India or Pakistan. Second, U.S. Air Force planners will have to devote relatively greater resources to mobility assets and support platforms such as airborne tankers to keep a smaller combat force capable of long-distance operations. Third, planners must begin to give some thought to novel technologies capable of mitigating the access and staging problem. These technologies can include, at the more radical end, floating air bases of the kind proposed by RAND several decades ago, or at the more conservative technical end, more-efficient engines, longer-range aircraft, and the like. Fourth, U.S. Air Force planners must increasingly think in terms of joint operations not merely at the cosmetic level, as in the cruise missile strikes against Iraq, but in terms of a true division of labor, especially in the early stages of a distant contingency. The fifth key implication derived from the analysis of **trends in Asia suggest**s **that WMD**-shadowed environments **will pose new** operational **challenges to air power.** There is little doubt that the **number of** states possessing different kinds of **WMD will increase** during the time frames examined in this report. While Russia, China, North Korea, India, and Pakistan are the only nuclear-capable states in Asia at the moment, several other states likely are virtual nuclear powers (Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan), with Iran and Iraq in the wings. All these states are threatened by nuclear capabilities in some form, and many will be able to mount nuclear threats of their own at some point. Although nuclear capabilities concentrate the mind in a way that few other weapons do, **chemical and bio**logical **weapon**s will also come in to their own, and their **use for** either operations or **terror may be even more probable.** All three forms of WMD, as well as radiological weapons, could be delivered by either ballistic or cruise missiles, advanced combat aircraft, or unconventional means of delivery. These regional operating environments will thus become more complicated over time. In this context, **the** U.S. **Air Force will require** both **new capabilities** and new concepts of operations for successful combat in such environments. **These** new capabilities **include** better means of **localizing WMD** holdings **at long range;** better means of **interdicting storage facilities**, especially those relying on depth or dispersal for survival; **and** better means of effectively **intercepting WMD carriers** if their prelaunch destruction is not possible. New concepts of operations involve devising and using better ways to continue combat operations amidst a WMD environment, new forms of warfare including information warfare to subvert an adversary’s combat capability rather than physically destroying it, and, finally, new “nonlethal” weapons to attain results previously attainable by lethal means alone.

## Space Mil Arms Race Impact

Immigration reform is key to aerospace competitiveness. **Thompson 9** writes[[50]](#footnote-50)

And finally, **despite** our best **efforts to increase the domestic supply of** well-qualified **aerospace engineers** and scientists, **it is AIAA's view that that** alone **will not** be sufficient to **fully address** the **problems** that our country is going to face **over the next decade** or so. And so **we** further **advocate** a **reexamination of immigration laws** and visa levels **so** that **we can** more effectively **attract** from around the world **the best and brightest** young people that want to come to our country and build their lives and careers here to strengthen our aerospace sector and the nation as a whole. In addition, within this general framework, AIAA and a number of other engineering societies across a variety of fields have advocated the pursuit of policies specifically focused on emphasizing the two middle initials in the STEM acronym, namely technology and engineering. I think we are farther behind in those areas **or we risk falling farther behind in those areas** than we perhaps do in the bracketing letters of science and math. All are important, but as we look out over the next decade, the challenges in engineering and technology may even be worse -- more severe than the challenges in the basic sciences and math. REP. EDWARDS: Thank you. And I'm sure we could go on but my time has expired, Madame Chairwoman. REP. GIFFORDS: Dr. Aubrecht, did you want to add -- (inaudible)? MR. AUBRECHT: Yes. Just to come back to the point that you made there in terms of immigration policy, we employ about 9,000 people in 26 countries around the world. We're headquartered in Buffalo, and that's where the center of our aerospace business is, but we've taken this technology into all kinds of other fields, and a number of cases where we'd like to bring people in from outside the U.S. and we just simply have a terrible time trying to get visas for these people to come in. So **I don't think we're going to** be able to **meet** the **needs from a** technological **staffing standpoint unless you open up** the **immigration. People** from all over the world would just **love to come** to the U.S. and work on these programs. This is where it's happening. **But they just can't get the visas.**

Space weaponization is inevitable. A strong space program is key to beat China to space. **Quigley 9** writes[[51]](#footnote-51)

Although it is not clear how long the Long War (GWOT) will consume a good portion of the annual US defense budget, increasing DoD funding to space programs is critical not only in supporting the GWOT, but also in deterring threatening space-faring nations such as China. The argument to maintain the space control advantage is emphasized from General Thomas D. White‘s statement, ―capability to deter war is enhanced by the ability to control space and that, in future wars, space control will be coequal with air and sea control.‖ 84 Today‘s DoD budget however does not reflect an equal funding stream of air-land-sea-space and cyber domains. In order **for the US to** be successful with **deter**ring **China’s rise in space** power, **they need to be first** to the punch – they must establish and maintain an aggressive offense to develop, procure and posture US military space assets similar to the effort given during the nuclear arms race of the Cold War. **Leading space theorists** such as Jim Oberg and Everett Dolman **suggest that weaponizing space is inevitable.**85 If this is to be the case, the US cannot afford to lose this race of controlling space. Oberg agrees that **the US cannot afford to lose** this opportunity (to be the first to field them), **otherwise it will** likely **find itself held hostage to the state that does.**86 Whatever the solution, a geo-political consideration to tactfully assess this space race is required so as not to diminish the years of good economic relations with China. **The US cannot be first to the punch without the proper care**, feeding, and funding **of its space** acquisition **programs.** Consistent with rebalanced national strategies and space policy, the DoD along with the Air Force should re-prioritize requirements for programs that support both the GWOT long war and emerging space threats such as China. Strategy and policy changes should drive funding allocation justified by events such as the recent Chinese ASAT shoot down.

China space heg causes Asian space race. **Moltz 12** writes[[52]](#footnote-52)

**The** main **impetus for** much of the **regional space tumult** over the past decade **is China’s** rapid **emergence as a military space power.** Though China published a 2011 white paper outlining its space plans that is notably silent on military aims, the country has been pressing forward toward a range of military space capabilities, including space weapons. In the most dramatic example (which Chinese officials first denied, then claimed was a threat to no one), China tested an antisatellite technology in 2007 by destroying a weather satellite, creating more than 3,000 large pieces of orbiting debris. It is one-third of the way into deploying a 35-satellite GPS system called Beidou that will help its missile guidance, although it will offer commercial navigation services as well. In the civil field, China is only the third country to have launched its own astronauts; in September 2011, it placed its first space station, Tiangong-1, into orbit. It has conducted an unmanned docking already, and its Shenzhou 9 mission later this year will bring the first Chinese astronauts—or taikonauts—to the station. With its rapidly growing economy, China can afford a large and increasing investment in all areas of space. While **this** is unsettling and even worrisome for the United States, it **poses an existential threat for China’s neighbors**. These countries face increased military risks and the prospect of losing political and economic influence as Beijing attempts to establish regional space hegemony. **India has reacted by establishing** a **new** agency called the Integrated Space Cell, bringing a group of military and civilian officials together to oversee **defense programs for space**. The government in New Delhi has ordered military satellites for each branch of its armed services and pledged to match China’s capability by deploying a ground-launched antisatellite weapon. Where India had previously concentrated on space applications in the service of its population (communications, telemedicine, and agricultural information), it has recently expanded its program in order to compete with China in high-prestige space science. Projects currently underway include its Chandrayaan-2 lunar lander and rover, a Mars mission, and an expensive, independent human space flight program. Meanwhile, on China’s eastern side, **Japan has felt** the **pressure to step up its game, or risk losing its** current **place as Asia’s space** technology **leader.** In the past decade, the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency has pushed ahead in launching the first mission to return particles from an asteroid, carried out a lunar mapping mission with high-definition imagery, built the Kibo research module for the International Space Station, and developed one of only three spacecraft systems now certified to supply the station. Most notably, **Japan shocked** many **observers by moving quickly** in 2008 following China’s antisatellite test **to end its** 30-year **ban on military space activities**. While the military’s main focus is on reconnaissance and early warning, senior Japanese leaders have not ruled out possible development of “defensive” space weapons in the future.

Space race causes extinction. Outweighs and turns nuclear war.

**Mitchell et al 01**[[53]](#footnote-53)

A buildup of space weapons might begin with noble intentions of 'peace through strength' deterrence, but this rationale glosses over the tendency that '… the presence of space weapons…will result in the increased likelihood of their use'. This drift toward usage is strengthened by a strategic fact elucidated by Frank Barnaby: when it comes to arming the heavens, 'anti-ballistic missiles and antisatellite warfare technologies go hand-in-hand'. The interlocking nature of offense and defense in military space technology stems from the inherent 'dual capability' of spaceborne weapon components. As Marc Vidricaire, Delegation of Canada to the UN Conference on Disarmament, explains: 'If you want to intercept something in space, you could use the same capability to target something on land'. To the extent that ballistic missile interceptors based in space can knock out enemy missiles in mid-flight, such interceptors can also be used as orbiting 'Death Stars', capable of sending munitions hurtling through the Earth's atmosphere. **The dizzying speed of space warfare would introduce intense 'use or lose' pressure** into strategic calculations, with the spectre of split-second attacks **creating** incentives to rig **orbiting Death Stars with** automated **'hair trigger' devices.** In theory, this automation would enhance survivability of vulnerable space weapon platforms. However, by taking the decision to commit violence out of human hands and endowing computers with authority to make war, military planners could sow insidious seeds of accidental conflict. Yale sociologist Charles Perrow has analyzed 'complexly interactive, tightly coupled' industrial systems such as space weapons, which have many sophisticated components that all depend on each other's flawless performance. According to Perrow, this **interlocking complexity makes** it impossible to foresee all the different ways such systems could fail. As Perrow explains, '[t]he odd term "normal accident" is meant to signal that, given the system characteristics, multiple and **unexpected** interactions of **failures** are **inevitable'.** Deployment of **space weapons** with pre-delegated authority to fire death rays or unleash killer projectiles **would** likely **make war itself inevitable,** given the susceptibility of such systems to 'normal accidents'. It is chilling to contemplate the possible effects of a space war. According to retired Lt. Col. Robert M. Bowman, **'even a tiny projectile** reentering-**from space** strikes the earth with such high velocity that it **can do** enormous damage — **even more [damage] than** would be done by **a nuclear weapon of the same size!'**. In the same Star Wars technology touted as a quintessential tool of peace, defense analyst David Langford sees one of the most destabilizing offensive weapons ever conceived: 'One imagines dead cities of microwave-grilled people'. Given this unique potential for destruction, it is not hard to imagine that **any nation** subjected to space weapon attack **would retaliate with maximum force, including** use of **nuclear, bio**logical, and/**or chemical weapons.** An accidental war sparked by a computer glitch in space could plunge the world into the most destructive military conflict ever seen.
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